

EDUARDO ARENS S.M.

THE HΛΘON -SAYINGS  
IN THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

A HISTORICO-CRITICAL INVESTIGATION

UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG FREIBURG SCHWEIZ  
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT GÖTTINGEN

1976

Publication subsidized by the Fribourg University Council,  
Fribourg Switzerland

© 1976 by Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz  
Paulusdruckerei Freiburg Schweiz

UV ISBN 3-7278-0148-4 V & R ISBN 3-525-53313-6

Digitalisat erstellt durch Florian Lippke, Departement für Biblische  
Studien, Universität Freiburg Schweiz

## C O N T E N T S

FOREWORD . . . . .	11
--------------------	----

### INTRODUCTION

A. History of the Investigation . . . . .	13
B. Description of Task and Procedure . . . . .	17
C. Delimitation of the Ἡλθον-sayings . . . . .	20

### PART ONE: EXEGESIS OF INDIVIDUAL PASSAGES

(Observations on Methodology) . . . . .	23
---	----

### CHAPTER ONE: THE "I HAVE COME" SAYINGS

#### I. COME TO CALL SINNERS: Mk.2,15-17/Mt.9,10-13/Lk.5,29-32

A. Literary Criticism . . . . .	28
B. Searching the Oldest (Reachable) Form . . . . .	38
C. Form and Formative Factors . . . . .	43
D. Authenticating Criteria and the Logion of Mk.2,17b . . . . .	47
E. From the Earliest Tradition to the Final Redaction	
1. The Ἡλθον-saying in the Redaction history of Mk . . . . .	51
2. The Ἡλθον-saying in the Matthean Redaction . . . . .	56
3. The Ἡλθον-saying within the Lukan Redaction . . . . .	60
Conclusion . . . . .	62

#### II. COME TO CAST FIRE - COME TO CAST THE SWORD: Lk.12,49-50.51-53/Mt.10,34-36

A. Literary Criticism	
1. The Logia of Lk.12,49.50 . . . . .	64
2. The Logion of Lk.12,51-53/Mt.10,34-36 . . . . .	67
B. Form and Formative Factors . . . . .	74
C. The Primitive Meaning of the Logia Lk.12,49 and Mt.10,34b, and the Redactors' Interpretative Work	
1. The Logion Lk.12,49 and the Lukan Interpretation . . . . .	77
2. The Redactors' Orientation of the Logion Mt.10,34 /Lk.12,51 . . . . .	80
D. The Authenticity of the Logia Lk.12,49 and Mt.10,34 . . . . .	82
E. The Significance of Ἡλθον in Lk.12,49 and Mt.10,34 . . . . .	87
Conclusion . . . . .	89

### III. COME TO FULFILL THE LAW: Mt.5,17(-20)

A. Brief Historico-Critical Study of Mt.5,18-20: A Way Toward the Understanding of v.17	
1. Durability of the Law: Mt.5,18 . . . . .	91
2. Attitude Towards the Law: Mt.5,19 . . . . .	94
3. Christian Righteousness: Mt.5,20 . . . . .	98
B. Critical Analysis of Mt.5,17 . . . . .	99
C. The Original Meaning and Posterior Interpretations of Mt.5,17	
1. The Original Meaning of v.17b . . . . .	103
2. The Meaning of v.17 in the light of the Antitheses	106
3. The Final Matthean Redactor's Outlook . . . . .	108
D. The Authenticity of the Logion Mt.5,17b . . . . .	111
E. Significance of ἡλθὼν in Mt.5,17 . . . . .	114
Conclusion . . . . .	115

### CHAPTER TWO: "THE SON OF MAN CAME" SAYINGS

#### I. COME TO SERVE: Mk.10,42-45/Mt.20,25-28/(Lk.22,25-27)

A. Differing Contexts . . . . .	117
B. Literary Criticism	
1. Mk.10,42-44/Mt.20,25-27 . . . . .	119
2. The Lukan Text . . . . .	125
C. Form and Formative Factors	
1. The Discourse in Mk/Mt . . . . .	129
2. The Lukan Version . . . . .	133
D. The Logia of Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28 and Lk.22,27	
1. The Logia of Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28 . . . . .	135
2. Mk.10,45 and Lk.22,27: The Logion of Service . . . . .	141
3. Mk.10,45, 1 Tim.2,6a, and Tit.2,13c.14a . . . . .	147
4. Mk.10,45b and the Words over the Cup . . . . .	147
Conclusion: The Ransom-Saying and Jesus . . . . .	151
E. The Authenticity of the Ransom Logion . . . . .	151
F. The Redactor's Outlook . . . . .	156
G. The Meaning of ἡρχεσθαι in Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28 . . . . .	158
Conclusion . . . . .	159

#### II. COME TO SEEK AND SAVE THE LOST: Lk.19,5-10

A. Literary Criticism . . . . .	162
B. Form and Formative Factors . . . . .	168
C. The Authenticity of the Logion Lk.19,10 . . . . .	174
D. The Redactor's Perspective . . . . .	176
E. The Verb ἡρχεσθαι in the Logion Lk.19,10 . . . . .	178
Conclusion . . . . .	179



### III. THE DUBIOUS LOGIA: Lk.9,56a and Mt.18,11

- A. The Son of Man Came to Save Souls: Lk.9,56a . . . . 180
- B. The Son of Man Came to Save the Lost: Mt.18,11 . . . 191

### CHAPTER THREE: OTHER HΛΘON - RELATED SAYINGS

#### I. COME FORTH TO PREACH: Mk.1,35-38/Lk.4,42-43

- A. Literary Analysis . . . . . 195
- B. The Earliest Reachable Form . . . . . 198
- C. Form and Formative Factors . . . . . 200
- D. The Meaning of 'ΕΞῆλθον in Mk.1,38 and Lk's 'Απεστάλην 203
- Conclusion . . . . . 209

#### II. DID YOU COME TO DESTROY US? Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34 and Mt.8,28/Mk.5,7/Lk.8,28

- A. Literary Considerations: Composition of the Demons' Reply
  - 1. The Demoniac in the Synagogue: Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34 . 210
  - 2. The Gerasene Demoniac: Mt.8,29/Mk.5,7/Lk.8,28 . 212
  - 3. The Earliest (Reachable) Form of the Demon's Reaction . . . . . 216
- B. Form and Formation of the Demon's Verbal Reaction . 216
- C. Significance of 'Ηλθες . . . . . 219
- Conclusion . . . . . 221

#### III. THE SON OF MAN CAME EATING AND DRINKING: Mt.11,16-19/Lk.7,31-35

- A. Literary Analysis . . . . . 222
- B. Form and Formative Factors . . . . . 230
- C. The Authenticity of the Logion Mt.11,18-19b/Lk.7,33-34b . . . . . 235
- D. From the Origin to the Final Redaction of Mt.11,16-19 par. . . . . 237
- E. The Meaning of 'Ερχεσθαι in Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f . . . 240
- Conclusion . . . . . 242

#### IV. THE COMING OF ELIJAH: Mk.9,11-13/Mt.17,10-12.13

- A. Literary Analysis . . . . . 244
- B. Form and Formative Factors . . . . . 245
- C. The Significance of 'Ερχεσθαι . . . . . 247

### PARTIAL CONCLUSION . . . . . 249

PART TWO: ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ΗΛΘΟΝ-FORM

CHAPTER FOUR: EXTRA BIBLICAL LITERATURE

(Introductory Observations)	254
A. The Greek and the Hellenistic Worlds	256
B. Qumran Texts	261
C. Samaritan Literature	264
D. Rabbinic Literature	265

CHAPTER FIVE: THE OLD TESTAMENT AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. יְהוָה/ἦλθον in the OT (MT/LXX)	271
B. The Coming of Yahweh	273
C. The Announcements of the Future Coming of God	276

II. THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

A. "I have come in order to" Texts	282
B. The Future Coming of the Messiah	283
Conclusion	285

CHAPTER SIX: FURTHER CHRISTOLOGICALLY ORIENTED USES OF ΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ

A. The Expression "Ὁ Ἐρχόμενος"	288
B. Further Significant Uses of Ἐρχεσθαι in the Synoptic Gospels	300
C. The Gospel of John	303
D. The Remaining Writings of the New Testament	307
E. Apocryphal Writings	308
F. Significant Uses of the Verbs Ἐξέρχεσθαι, Ἦκειν, Ἀποστέλλειν and Πέμπειν	
1. Ἐξέρχεσθαι	309
2. Ἦκειν	310
3. Ἀποστέλλειν	311
Sent to the House of Israel: Mt.15,24	315
4. Πέμπειν	320
G. The Coming of the Baptist	322
Conclusion	324

CHAPTER SEVEN: A NEW LOOK AT THE SYNOPTIC HΛΘON-LOGIA

A. ἩΛΘΟΝ in the Light of the OT, Apocrypha and Pseude-  
pigrapha . . . . . 325

B. The ἩΛΘΟΝ-logia and Jesus' Messiahship . . . . . 328

C. The Messianic Consciousness and the ἩΛΘΟΝ-logia . 337

D. The ἩΛΘΟΝ-logia in the Perspective of the Evange-  
lists . . . . . 339

CONCLUSION . . . . . 344

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . 350

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 351



## FOREWORD

The present study was presented as a Doctoral dissertation to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) at the beginning of the Winter Semester of 1975/76. The topic under study was suggested and directed by Prof. Georg Schelbert, who deemed that it was time to take a closer look at the group of sayings of the Lord which are characterized by their ἡλθον plus infinitive formulation. To our knowledge there has not yet been a detailed study of these sayings as a group. The contribution that an in-depth study of these sayings can mean to Christology is not unimportant. However, since the task which I have undertaken is primarily exegetical, I refrain from entering too deeply into the theologian's vaster concerns.

Acknowledgments are due to many persons. But, my gratitude is extended most particularly to Prof. M.-É. Boismard who, with his proverbial generosity and encouraging patience, not only guided me in the course of the first draft of most of the present investigation, but also taught me more than he suspects during my studies at the "École Biblique de Jérusalem". It goes without saying that, if it were not for Prof. G. Schelbert who closely watched and followed my work till the end, this study would never have seen the light of day. Special thanks are also due to Odo Camponovo for many helpful suggestions, and to Don Maldari for the amount of time he spent revising the manuscript from the linguistic point of view.

Last, but not least, I owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. Y.-E. Trémel for inviting me to publish my dissertation within the series "Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis".

Fribourg, February 1976.

Eduardo Arens



## INTRODUCTION

### A. HISTORY OF THE INVESTIGATION

Before determining the task to be undertaken, it is important to survey the work that other scholars have done before us on the topic under consideration in order, not so much to criticize it, but to evaluate it and to be conscious of what has already been done and need not be duplicated. A survey of previous studies also helps to specify the task that might remain to be done and/or the approach to be taken.

#### 1. A. Harnack (1912)

The first comprehensive study of the ἡλθον-sayings (see our delimitation of these in §C) was Adolf Harnack's article, "'Ich bin gekommen'. Die ausdrücklichen Selbstzeugnisse Jesu über den Zweck seiner Sendung und seines Kommens" in ZTK 22 (1912), p.1-30. He analyzed individually each of these "programmatische Sprüche" (p.1), though isolated from their context, and sought to answer mainly two questions: their authenticity and their inner content and implications. Since Harnack readily accepted the authenticity of these logia, i.e. as having been pronounced by Jesus in their present form, the question of the possible origin of this form of speech -- outside of Jesus himself -- became futile and was not posed. The authenticity of these logia as ipsissima verba Iesu was concluded especially on grounds of adequacy and appropriateness rather than on critico-exegetical considerations. It is noteworthy that he accepted Lk.9,55 as authentic (p.15f.) but hesitated about Mk.10,45b (p.9). For Harnack the ἡλθον-sayings are not Messianically spoken. They say nothing about the Messiah; they are not Messianic claims and it should not be read into the text (ibid.). To seek the Messianic consciousness of Jesus in these logia would be out of place according to Harnack (p.28f). "Ob die Verba 'Gesandt sein', 'Kommen' messianisch zu verstehen sind, darüber kann nur der Kontext entscheiden...; aber immer drücken sie in der religiösen Sprache eine Sendung von der Gottheit her bzw. ein Kommen in ihrem Auftrage aus." (p.1). Behind the ἡλθον formulation lies a sense of definitiveness and au-

thority (p.28).

Among the ἡλθον-sayings, Harnack, like R. Bultmann after him, included Mt.15,24 but excluded Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f, the former on the grounds that ἀπεστράλην is a complementary way of saying ἡλθον and that its content is similar to that of Lk.19,10 and Mt.10,5f (p.21), the latter on the grounds that "ἡλθεν ist nicht emphatisch" (p.3 n.1). He rejected Mt.18,11 on textual grounds (p.3). Not only is there no attempt made to relate the logia to their contexts, but the question about the oldest reachable form of the logia is rarely touched upon. There is no question of a possible background (OT or other) of this form of saying, nor about the term "Son of Man" in the ἡλθεν-sayings. Unfortunately there is no word about the use of ἐξέρχμενος. Harnack was overconfident in finding a new basis for the appreciation of Jesus in the ἡλθεν-sayings on account of their authenticity and programmatic affirmations. In his ethical and individualistic understanding of these sayings, wherein he gives no room for the eschatological -- as is most evident in his considerations of Lk.12,49-53 par. (p.4-6, 11f) -- he remained within the circle of Liberal Theologians, from which he wanted to escape. Most regrettable is that he barely took into account the historical and literary context of these sayings, as R. Bultmann rightly observed.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. R. Bultmann (1921)

Not long after Harnack's article, Rudolf Bultmann published his epoch-making work Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (1921, 2d ed. 1931)<sup>2</sup> wherein he dedicated a few pages to the ἡλθεν-sayings (p.152-156), forming part of a larger group that Bultmann called "I-sayings a parte potiori" (p.152). In his list he included Mk.1,38/Lk.4,43 as well as Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f (which had been set aside by Harnack) and Mt.15,24; Lk.10,16; Mk.9,37; Mt.10,40 where the verb ἀποστράλην occurs. After stating that "There are no possible grounds for objecting to the idea that Jesus could have spoken

<sup>1</sup>ST 156 n.2: "It is the inadmissible isolation of these sayings,... that is, in my view, Harnack's error."

<sup>2</sup>References are to the revised English transl. made by J. Marsh, in 1968.



in the first person about himself and his coming; that need be no more than what befits his prophetic self-consciousness," he warned that "as individual sayings they rouse a number of suspicions." (p.153). He examined these logia rather briefly, finding reasons that would explain why they could not have been said by Jesus. Contrary to Harnack's approach, Bultmann took upon himself the burden of the proof of inauthenticity! As a result all of the logia he studied could be explained as Church products that look back at the totality of Jesus' mission. According to Bultmann this assertion is unquestionable for the ἡλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου logia: SM is indicative of a Hellenistic origin, a presupposition contested by J. Jeremias. For Bultmann, given that most of the ἡλθον-sayings are Church creations, those few that seem most authentic (Lk.12,49; Mk.2, 17 par.) are also to be suspected as having had a similar origin: "one can have but little confidence" in these (p.155). He clearly confessed: "I am yet doubtful about proceeding by taking other sayings out of the complex of ἡλθον-sayings, where there are certainly community products and making genuine sayings of Jesus out of them, even though they may well be appropriate expressions for his consciousness of his calling." (p.156). That means that for Bultmann they stand or fall as a block ("Komplex"), all or none are authentic. This profound scepticism he found reinforced in the Church's application of ὁ ἐρχόμενος to Jesus and in the fact that the OT never speaks of a prophet in terms of his "coming" (*ibid.*). Bultmann consequently suggested an origin other than Jesus, the OT, and the Church (?), for this form of speech, but unfortunately contented himself with simply concluding that "the assertion of Jesus having come derives from a quite different sphere" (p.156): which? On the bases of Johannine usage and of 1 Tim.1,15, which are Church products, Bultmann concluded that "ἐλθεῖν and ἀποσταλῆναι (or πεμφθῆναι) are typical of the terminology of a later time." (p.155f).

Bultmann can be reproached of too readily declaring a logion to be inauthentic without seeking its oldest reachable

<sup>3</sup>"Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," ZNW 58 (1967), 159-172.

form, i.e. of not carrying out a literary analysis. What to me is inadmissible is his generalizing conclusion that because some logia are undoubtedly Church products, all have to be thought to have had the same origin. His whole attention is absorbed by the question of authenticity of the logia, for which he seems to have used two criteria: their form and their content. The term SM renders them ipso facto inauthentic, without asking himself whether primitively they could have been in the first person. The content is judged on the basis of the present form. Logia are declared to be inauthentic whenever they can be explained as products of the early Church. Authenticity should be weighed only once the oldest reachable form has been established. If Harnack is overconfident on tradition, Bultmann is hypersceptic.

### 3. The Lexical Dictionaries.

In his article ἐρεχόμεναι for the TDNT (vol.II), J. Schneider dedicated two paragraphs to the ἡλθον-sayings (p.668f). He stated that this verb "belongs to the circle of ideas connected with the divine epiphany." (p.669). Reacting to Bultmann's affirmation that these are "secondary constructions at a later stage," Schneider contended that in them we grasp "Jesus' certainty of mission" and, even though their final form is a community product, they are directly related to Jesus himself and "derive from the Messianic self-awareness of Jesus and are to be explained thereby." (p.668). Similarly, W. Mundle, in his article "Kommen" in the ThBL II/1 wherein he dedicated four short paragraphs to the ἡλθον-sayings (p.805f, par.3a), opposed Bultmann's conclusions and saw in these logia "Jesu messianisches Selbstverständnis" (p.805). Mundle asks: "wie will man die Entstehung dieses Glaubens [of the Church in Jesus' mission] begreifen, wenn Jesus ein solches Sendungsbewusstsein nicht gehabt hat?" (p.806). Mundle's observations demand a distinction that is not always made: a mission-consciousness (like the prophets of old!) is not the same as the messianic consciousness! These scholars, and most recently H. Zimmermann, among others,<sup>4</sup> find the origin of this

<sup>4</sup>Methodenlehre, 150; Jeremias, NTTh I, 83; Montefiore, Syn. Gospels II, 47; Plummer, Mt 76; Grundmann, Mt 143.

form of speech in Jesus himself. That is indeed the impression obtained from a rapid survey of the ἡλθον-sayings, but it remains to be seen if the same conclusion is reached after a detailed study of each of these.

#### 4. J.P. Miranda (1972)

Most recently Juan Peter Miranda, in his dissertation Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat (1972) wherein he studied the uses of ἔρχομαι in the NT (p.39-48), dedicated five pages to the ἡλθον-sayings (p.43-47). Following Bultmann he considered these logia as looking back on Jesus' earthly mission, having been stylized and belonging to the realm of epiphanic representations (p.44). Miranda sees in these sayings a "kerygmaticizing" development (compare Mk.1,38 -- ἐξῆλθον-- with Lk.4,43 -- ἀπεστάλην). With E. Käsemann he is of the opinion that the ἡλθον-sayings "nicht vom irdischen Jesus stammen können, sondern durch Prophetenmund die Stimme des erhöhten Herren vernehmen lassen." (p.45). For Miranda the Syn ἡλθον-sayings and the Johannine ἀπεστάλην-words belong together; this does not imply a literary dependence, but rather has "eine gemeinsame Tradition und theologische Konzeption" (p.47). Ὁ ἐρχόμενος is, in Jn, a "Messiastitel" taken over from the Syn tradition and ultimately going back to the LXX (p.40). Even though his was not an in-depth study of the ἡλθον-sayings (as it was not his purpose), he has touched upon the major questions these logia raise as a group.

The studies presented are the most comprehensive that, to my knowledge, have been carried out to date on the ἡλθον-sayings. Isolated opinions on this or that logion, as well as general statements about the sense of ἡλθον, have been omitted here for the sake of simplicity but will be pointed out in the course of our study when called for.

#### B. DESCRIPTION OF TASK AND PROCEDURE

The studies just reviewed, the most detailed being Harnack's, and the observations I was prompted to make, lead us to describe the task they have left for us to undertake. It be-

---

<sup>5</sup>"Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," in ZTK 1960, 176.

comes at once evident that a critical and detailed appraisal of these logia, one by one, remains imperative before any all-inclusive conclusion may be drawn: not all logia spring from the same circumstances and have the same "personality"! Since the time of Harnack (and Bultmann) a better understanding of the NT has been gained, new approaches have been established, and the methodology has been refined.

The work is divided into two Parts, corresponding to two approaches and to different questions asked. In Part I we shall study in detail the pericopes where an ἡλθον-saying is found, including those that are very closely related to them. In Part II we shall go behind the ἡλθον-sayings themselves and search the possible origin of this form of speech and the significance it has. We shall then reconsider our logia in this light to learn what their ultimate significance may be.

Following the initial delimitation of the group of sayings that are the object of our study (cf. §C, infra) we proceed to analyze each of these. Differing from our predecessors, we shall study each logion within its immediate context (as well as the context itself), and not in isolation. This will enable us to answer a number of questions such as: had the ἡλθον-saying originally a separate existence or was it always an integral part of its present context? what is the relation of the logion to its context? what was the original sense of the logion and how was it interpreted at the different stages of the redactional history of the pericope? Concerning the logion itself we shall attempt to recover its oldest form and rediscover its most primitive (reachable) meaning. That will at once show the interpretative changes the logion may have suffered in the course of time, within the early Church as well as within each redactor's milieu. It will be the earliest reachable form of the logion under study that will be submitted to a closer examination in view of answering the question of its authenticity, i.e. its closeness to the historical Jesus. We shall conclude with a consideration of the implications and meaning of ἡλθον in the logion under study throughout the history of its transmission. Here we shall consider the aspect and extent of Jesus' career that ἡλθον englobes, where the accent lies and the "type of consciousness" it reveals.

This is done in Chapters One and Two. In Chapter Two we shall also consider the significance of the expression "Son of Man" in connection with ἡλθεν.

In Chapter Three we shall consider four sayings that are closely related to the ἡλθον-ones. These are singled out on account of the significant use of the verb ἔρχομαι and the light they shed on the logia that concern us. We shall study these in detail, following the same procedure we did for the ἡλθον-sayings, though soon limiting ourselves to the significance of ἔρχομαι in each of these. We shall terminate the first part of our study with a partial conclusion, gathering the results of our research of the individual pericopes and sayings before embarking into the broader research that constitutes Part II, and to which c.III serves as a bridge.

An inquiry into the possible origin and background of this form of speech constitutes the object of the next two chapters (IV and V). There we consider the uses of the ἡλθον (+ inf.) form of speech outside the NT in view of answering some delimiting questions such as: among what class of people (messengers, rulers, divinities) was the emphatic and authoritative ἡλθον manner of speaking current? where was it more common (OT, Hellenistic world, etc.)? and under what circumstances was it used? In a word, was it a fixed form of speech used in some particular circumstance(s)? It is customary to begin a study with a nature such as ours with this inquiry. I have decided to invert the order and begin with the ἡλθον-sayings themselves because I thought it convenient not to bias the initial study of the individual logia -- especially by reading into the text what it may not by itself say. It is true that the NT should be understood in the light of the OT (and other contemporary literature!), but it seems to me that the first step is to try to understand the NT passage within the frame of (the various steps of) its composition. The inquiry in these two chapters is of a different nature than that of Chapters I-III; here we are concerned with the form in se: to investigate the usage and scope of this form of speech.

A survey of the uses of ἔρχομαι and other closely related verbs in the rest of the NT, as well as for other significant

uses of the same in the Syn is the object of c.VI. This allows us to determine the extent to which ἦλθον was used to describe Jesus' coming and presence among men, the different meanings and implications it acquired and inglobed, and the relation to other modes of speech, especially that of "sent" and the titular-like ὁ ἐρχόμενος. The meaning of ἦλθον in the Syn will thus hopefully be defined.

Finally, in our last chapter we shall turn our attention to the content of the logia, given by the infinitive(s) of purpose. The purpose(s) that the ἦλθον-sayings serve will be considered in the light of the known current messianic expectations. It is hoped that thereby the question of these logia as expressions of Jesus' messianic consciousness, which is of interest especially to the theologian, may be further clarified. We shall likewise reconsider the ἦλθον-sayings in the light of the inquiries carried out in Chapters IV-VI, with the intention of defining and exposing the ultimate meaning and importance of these logia.

### C. DELIMITATION OF THE ΗΛΘΟΝ-SAYINGS.

The logia that will be closely analyzed and which constitute a well defined group, characterized by the construction ἦλθον (or ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) followed by an infinitive specifying a purpose or finality, are best classed thus:

1. Those wherein the first person singular (ἦλθον) is employed, viz.:

-Mk.2,17/Mt.9,13/Lk.5,32:

οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.

-Lk.12,49:

πῶς ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

-Mt.10,34/Lk.12,51:

οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν.

-Mt.5,17:

οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι [τὸν νόμον...] ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

2. Those wherein, in lieu of ἦλθον, the titular "Son of Man" (ἦλθεν) is used:

-Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28/(diff.Lk.22,27):

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν

-Lk. 19, 10:

ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

-the textually dubious Lk. 9, 56a:

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι.

-and Mt. 18, 11:

ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

The logion of Mt. 15, 24 (οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ) is omitted for, not only is there no infinitive of purpose, but ἀπεστάλην belongs to a different circle of representations and will be treated together with the uses of ἀποστέλλειν.

Before we turn to the detailed study of these logia, a few preliminary observations of the ἦλθον + inf. grammatical construction impose themselves.<sup>6</sup> This construction corresponds to the Hebr. <sup>4</sup> אָבָן/יָבֵן and the Aram. <sup>4</sup> אָבָן/יָבֵן. In view of the fact that a purpose is indicated, ἦλθον is an aorist having a perfective sense = "I have come" (as in the NEB, RSV, JB). This does not necessarily mean that the purpose intended has already been fulfilled! It can be understood as stating a (past) historical ingressive (=inceptive) action holding good at the time spoken and projecting into the future: "I came and still am here in order to...."<sup>7</sup> Whether it can be considered as a global aorist (=constative)<sup>8</sup> that looks back to the totality of Jesus' mission on earth, as R. Bultmann and others proposed, is a question which demands the separate study of each individual logion.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup>For the sake of simplicity we shall speak of ἦλθον but the reader may assume that, unless otherwise stated, the form ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is also meant.

<sup>7</sup>Thus also often Jeremias. To the contrary, Ashby, "The Coming" 360, for whom it is a punctual aorist referring to the Incarnation.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Zerwick, Greek §253f.

<sup>9</sup>Montefiore, Syn. Gospels II, 47; Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 259 (cf. also Michel, "Ich komme" 124) indicated that the Aram. אָבָן can also mean "to be present" (I am here) which corresponds well to the perfective sense of ἦλθον in our sayings, even if in them there is more than just the idea of being present.





# PART ONE

## EXEGESIS OF INDIVIDUAL PASSAGES

In this first part we shall study each of the pericopes wherein an ἡλθον-saying is found. Our primary interest is to investigate the formative development of the pericope and logion by attempting to recover the earliest form of the logion and by determining its relation to the pericope. All this will provide us with the key to the understanding of the significance of ἡλθον (+ inf.) throughout the history of the tradition(s) that transmitted it. However, before we plunge into this detailed study, a few words about the methodology followed are necessary.

Every pericope is submitted to three "criticisms" that modern exegesis recognizes as fundamental, viz. literary, form, and redaction criticism. Every logion is furthermore questioned so as to discover its formal origin (authenticity) and the significance of ἡλθον. The various aspects under which the pericope is considered are closely interdependent and complement each other, since they all converged at a given moment of composition.

Textual criticism, the first step necessary in any study of a text, is not treated separately for the simple reason that only exceptionally is there a serious uncertainty about the original text. Textual criticism is employed whenever, because of important MS variants, it becomes necessary to determine the most probable authentic text. Variant readings are generally indicated in footnotes at the appropriate places. However, two logia (Lk.9,56a and Mt.18,11) will be the object of detailed text-critical study given the uncertainty of their original inclusion in the Gospels bequeathed to us.

By means of a detailed literary critical analysis of the pericope containing an ἡλθον-saying we attempt to recover the pre-final form of the pericope. At the same time we consider

the literary relation between the pericope itself and the ἡλθον-saying. Literary criticism also permits us to attempt to recover the oldest reachable form of our logion. Literary criticism, to which I attach more importance than is often allotted, provides us retroactively with the first indications of the history of the formation, development and shaping -- the trajectory -- of our text. It is complemented and explicated by Form and Redaction critical considerations. We cannot ignore the fact that the final redactor as well as his predecessor used source(s) and, though keeping the kernel, reshaped it/them in conformity with his particular outlook and concerns. The form of the text that was at the basis of the pre-final redactor may not always be recoverable (esp. in Lk whenever he has totally rewritten his source's text); whenever it seems recoverable the criteria can no longer be of style and vocabulary, but are primarily those of internal coherence and "christianizations", i.e. readaptations necessary at a time when certain concepts were no longer familiar to the addressees. The reconstitution of a pre-final text is already hypothetical and the further we regress in an attempt to find the probable oldest form of a text, i.e. the further we remove ourselves from the text we possess today the more hypothetical the conclusions are. This is the reason why I have avoided as far as possible using a "dogmatic language" of certitude.

It is customary in certain quarters to determine the possible literary dependency between our texts on the basis of a Synoptic theory which is taken as a presupposition. This is almost always the so-called "Two Source Theory" which among German exegetes is a sort of "Dogma of Faith". I do not question the value of this theory. However, the fact that many theories have been proposed is a clear indication that none, including the "Two Source Theory", has proved to answer satisfactorily the Syn problem. Even though, of all those proposed -- on the basis of painful analysis -- the "Two Source Theory" answers best the problems posed by the Syn texts, especially if completed by the inclusion of the special sources (for Lk and Mt), it seems to me still to be an oversimplification for it does not take into account a pre-final stage of redaction

(written, not oral) and the possible sources that played a role in the pre-final formulation of our text. A re-discovery of such a stage of composition was what E. Hirsch, in his work Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums,<sup>1</sup> had attempted. In recent years the works of R. Pesch<sup>2</sup> and others have shown a renewed interest in the recovery of the pre-final form of our gospels. However, this is almost always limited to the gospel of Mk. The most thorough study of the whole question on the basis of a study of all the pericopes of the Syn is that done by M.-É. Boismard, in his commentary to the Synopse des Quatre Évangiles en Français (vol.2). The theory which he proposes as a result of four years of study of every Syn pericope seems at first sight extremely complicated, but on closer analysis is nothing but the "Two Source Theory" in an amplified version and, even though not pretending to be the answer, it responds to more problems than most other theories do.

I am convinced that to begin the study of a pericope, especially when parallels exist, without a fixed theory enhances the possibilities of objectivity and diminishes presuppositions. Furthermore, it leaves the doors open to any possible solution which text relations might dictate on the basis of literary and allied criteria. To begin a study of a pericope with a fixed theory closes the doors to some possibilities of solutions other than those dictated by the theory adopted as a presupposition. The danger is to force the researcher to twist the analysis so as to have it fit the adopted theory. It must not be forgotten that each Gospel has a "Redaktionsgeschichte" of its own: a development, re-adaptation to new situations, at times new "Source(s)", and different influences coming from different quarters and working their way into our present Gospels. That no one theory is totally satisfactory is an indication that there are elements

---

<sup>1</sup>2 vols. Tübingen 1941, 1951<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Already in his dissertation Naherwartungen. Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13, Düsseldorf 1968, and in almost every one of his studies. In recent years this search for the pre-final form has been carried out esp. in studies about the Passion and the Resurrection.

hardly known to us which make it almost impossible to find one "theory" explaining the Syn problem. The problem remains complex and therefore every pericope ought to be studied separately; the study of different pericopes may result in a different Syn solution. It is not, however, my intention to dwell on this problem, nor to re-work the Syn problem. What I have stated has been said only in view of explaining the reason why I shall approach the study of the pericopes that concern us without a pre-conceived Synoptic theory. This option, which could also be labelled "a presupposition", is the result of my own studies and many hours of discussion with scholars of different "Synoptic creeds".

Under the heading Form and Formative Factors I propose to precise the particular "form" under which the pericope as a whole, in its final and pre-final form, is to be classed, as well as the type of logion we have to deal with. This latter investigation springs more from the point of view of content than external construction. More important yet are the various "settings in life" (Sitz im Leben) which played a formative role in the shaping of the pericope and the logion.

Having recovered the probable oldest form of the ἡλθον-logion under study, we shall pass to an examination of the probabilities of its being ipsissima vox, if not ipsissimum verbum Iesu.<sup>3</sup> Among the multitude of authenticating criteria advanced by scholars<sup>4</sup> the most objective are: multiple attestation, language, coherence, and distinctiveness.<sup>5</sup> A description of each of these criteria is found immediately before their application on the occasion of the first logion that is examined (Mk.2,17b par.; p.47-51).

---

<sup>3</sup>I distinguish between ipsissima verba and ipsissima vox. By the former I mean the faithful preservation of the words pronounced by Jesus; this is a constant concern of J. Jeremias. By the latter I mean a loose preservation of a saying of Jesus, wherein we "hear him speaking"; there is no question of a tape-recorded-like reproduction of exact words.

<sup>4</sup>See the summary and critical examination of these esp. in the art. by N.J. McEleney, "Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7:1-23," in CBQ 34(1972), 431-460.

<sup>5</sup>Perrin, Rediscovering 37-49, also considers these four to be the most valuable authenticating criteria.

The Redaction-critical re-appraisal of the pericope and logion moves us in a direction opposite to that of literary criticism. By the latter we intend to go back as far as possible to the earliest form of our pericope and logion; by the former we retrace our steps searching a closer explanation for the different changes, additions, and/or subtractions that took place in the course of the transmission of our pericope and in the different circles (Mk,Mt,Lk). We shall concentrate on the effect(s) these had on the logion. Here we can find an added reason for the addition of the logion, if and when it took place, as well as the eventual changes it may have undergone.

The exegetical minded reader may be surprised not to find any heading about the Tradition history of the text and/or logion under study. This "omission" corresponds to the fact that the history of the pericope runs throughout the whole study of it. It appears when the text is subjected to a literary analysis and it is then precised when we consider the "setting in life" (Sitz im Leben) of the text bequeathed to us by the final redactor and his source(s) and again in the Redaction-critical observations. Once the reachable "stages of tradition" of the text have been recovered, they are further elaborated through Form-critical considerations and hence never lost sight of. Recovering the reachable stages of tradition is our first concern and it is for this reason that I attach much importance to literary analysis.

Finally, we shall take a closer look at the meaning and implications that ἡλθον (+ inf.) had in the various stages of tradition of the logion and pericope under study.

It will be noticed that discussion with positions taken by other exegetes and which differ from mine are reduced to a minimum and are mostly relegated to footnotes. This is done for the sake of simplicity and because previous work I have done convinced me that such discussions rarely serve a constructive purpose.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE "I HAVE COME" SAYINGS

#### I. COME TO CALL SINNERS: Mk.2,15-17/Mt.9,10-13/Lk.5,29-32.<sup>1</sup>

This pericope, which is preserved by the three Syn constitutes a coherent and self-contained independent unit (cf. infra). In all three Gospels it follows the cure of a paralytic and the call of Levi and is followed by the dispute about fasting. It is, however, to be observed that Mk.2,3-3,6 par. is a collection of controversy stories and the call of Levi does not fit therein. There is, furthermore, no indication of time and place.

#### A. Literary Criticism.<sup>2</sup>

1. The Transitional Introduction: v.15a. The beginning of the pericope has, most particularly in Mk, evidence of a redactional effort to relate it to that of the vocation of Levi. Four observations support the suspicion that the two pericopes have been intentionally brought together via v.15a: (1) the change of tenses when passing from Mk.2,15a (historical pte.) to v.15b (impft.), (2) the absence of a definite subject in v.15a, introduced only in v.15b --one does not know who the αὐτόν is nor whose house is meant!-- (3) the change in verb used for "reclining" at table, as well as an apparent repetition of this precision: κατακεῖσθαι, v.15a, (συν)ανακεῖσθαι, v.15b,<sup>3</sup> and (4) the verb ἀκολουθεῖν in v.15b which is probably introduced to

<sup>1</sup>The most complete studies on this pericope are those of G.G. Gamba, "Considerazioni in margine alla redazione di Mc 2, 13-17," Divus Thomas 72(1969), 201-226, B.M.F. van Iersel, "La vocation de Lévi," in De Jésus aux Évangiles, Gembloux 1967, 212-232, and R. Pesch, "Das Zöllnergastmahl," Mélanges Bédarigaux, Gembloux 1970, 63-87.

<sup>2</sup>For the sake of simplicity, the versification followed throughout is that of Mk.

<sup>3</sup>κατακεῖσθαι, a classical term, is used in Mk (0/2/1) as often as ἀνακεῖσθαι (5/2/2), the latter being preferred by Mt probably because it is less ambiguous than the former; συνανακεῖσθαι is not rare either (2/2/3).

conform with v.14. Even though the use of the historical pte. is most frequent in Mk,<sup>4</sup> here καὶ γίνεταί preserves the tense of his source.<sup>5</sup> It is found again only in 4,37; RMk seems to prefer the aor. in narratives.<sup>6</sup> Mt, who does not always shun the historical pte., (cf. the par. to Mk.2,21;4,19.32), here has changed it to the aor. not only to smoothen the transition between the two pericopes but also because of his preference for the absolute gen. in lieu of the infinitive.<sup>7</sup> In both it remains a timeless and spaceless introduction.<sup>8</sup> It is not easy to determine with certitude whose house is meant: Jesus' (if ἑαυτόν= Jesus, and αὐτόν=αὐτοῦ) or Levi's? However, since the pericope ties the vocation of Levi, who is named, with a meal that is made to follow and where the owner of the house is not named, we may deduce that the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ refers to Levi's house. This supposition smoothenes out most problems.<sup>9</sup> We find ourselves in Levi's hometown to which Jesus

<sup>4</sup>W. Hendriks, "Zur Kollektionsgeschichte der Markusevangeliums," in L'Évangile selon Marc, Louvain 1974, 44 n.35, indicates the number of occurrences: 96/150/12+14/165. See also Hawkins, HS 143-149. In Mk the historical pte. is frequently found at the beginning of a pericope. This usage is good Gk, often found in the LXX and papyri; cf. Pernot, Études 189f, 195-199 and Hendriks, art.cit. 35-57, esp. 53-56.

<sup>5</sup>Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 71; Boismard, Synopse 111; Hendriks, art.cit. 51. We also find the following text variants: C,A,the Koine and Lake groups, vg,syr<sup>p</sup>,sa,bo, which read καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακείσθαι κτλ., probably harmonizing with Mt. D,W and it read καὶ ἐγένετο κατακειμένων κτλ.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. 1,4.9; 2,23; 4,4.10.39; 6,14; 9,3.6.7(2x).26; 11,19; 15,33, as well as the observations of Gamba, "Considerazioni" 205 +n.28,29.

<sup>7</sup>Besides the evidently redactional transition phrase repeated in 7,28; 11,1; 13,53; 19,1 and 26,1, Mt also uses the aor.ἐγένετο in 8,24.26; 9,10; 17,2; 27,45 and 28,2.

<sup>8</sup>Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 15; Beyer, Semitische Syntax I, 51: it only serves a rhetorical purpose.

<sup>9</sup>Pesch, art.cit. 71; Haenchen, Weg 108f; Grundmann, Mk 61, among others also see it thus. Likewise Luke! However, Schmidt, Rahmen 85f (maybe Jesus'); Gould, Mk 41; Lohmeyer, Mk 55 and Mt 171, as well as Jeremias, NTTh I, 115 n.1 ("could be") consider it to refer to Jesus' own house. Klostermann, Mk 25; Schmid, Mk 64; Nineham, Mk 99; Taylor, Mk 204 and Kuhn, Sammlungen 58, indicate that originally it had been Jesus' house but when this pericope was linked with the call of Levi it came to mean that the meal took place at the latter's house.

happens to have come: he did not settle in Capharnaum and even refused to do so (cf. Mk.1,35ff).

2. Tax-collectors and Sinners. In v.15b the reference to the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί leads one to ask whether these are not two different "classes" of people. "Sinner" is a moral condition and "tax-collector" is a profession. The term sinner in the mouth of a Jew refers to the ῥαῖν-ἄν, i.e. to those who do not keep the Law in its fullest sense.<sup>10</sup> Tax-collectors (=portitores)<sup>11</sup> were the employees of the publicani and had a widely spread bad reputation.<sup>12</sup> In the eyes of official Judaism the tax-collectors were classed as sinners because of their profession, which was associated with robbery (cf. Mt.19,8; Lk. 18,11b), and were despised because they worked for the pagan oppressor. Thus, for the pious Jew a tax-collector was included within the wide range of those considered to be "sinners," i.e. of the ῥαῖν-ἄν.<sup>13</sup> In v.16 the absence of a second article, which would distinguish two groups, indicates that tax-collectors and sinners are considered as constituting one class of people: those "outside of the Law."<sup>14</sup> The classification of tax-collectors as sinners or lawless is not due to Jesus or to Christianity, for whom the idea of a sinner was quite differ-

<sup>10</sup>Albright-Mann, Mt 105, translated "non-observant (Jews)". In the eyes of the Pharisees it cannot have referred to all non-Pharisees (as held e.g. by Swete, Mk 41) because certainly not all Scribes belonged to the circle of Pharisees and these were not considered to be sinners (cf. Kuhn, Sammlungen 61). According to Toh.7,6 and Ned.3,4 there exist three kinds of sinners: 1. Jews who could return whenever they repent, 2. Gentiles, and 3. Jews who made themselves like Gentiles. We ought to beware of taking the Pauline concept of "sinner" as expressed in Rom.5,8-19 and Gal.2,17 and to project it here for that was not the view current in Judaism.

<sup>11</sup>A detailed study will be found in the dissertation of S.N. Sakkou, ΟΙ ΤΕΛΩΝΑΙ, Thessalonika 1968.

<sup>12</sup>See the judgments passed for instance in Herondas vi,64; Aristoph. Eq. 247f; Lucian, Necyom. 11; Diog. 39,4.1; Cicero, de Off. 1,150, and Billerbeck I, 377f.

<sup>13</sup>See the studies of R. Meyer, "Der Ḥam hā-'Āreṣ," Jud 3 (1947), 169-199; Jeremias, "Zöllner und Sünder," ZNW 30(1931), 293-300, as well as Kuhn, Sammlungen 59ff.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. B1-D §276. In Mt.18,17b we find pagans (ἔθνικός) and tax-collectors, in 21,31b tax-collectors and prostitutes, side by side. See Qid.4,14 for the list of professions considered to be immoral, also Jeremias, "Zöllner" 296-300, Jerusalem c.XIV.



ent from that of Judaism. A sinner breaks all relations with God and stubbornly refuses to repent. This was not necessarily the condition of a tax-collector but was the view held by the Pharisees and so v.16b fits well on their lips. Thus, the reference to sinners in v.16a must be due to later tradition which stereotyped this couplet (which we find again in Lk.15,1; 7,34 par.) and here was used to prepare for the objection of v.16b.<sup>15</sup> Note also that in v.16a they are in inverse order! "Sinners" must have been present in a text known to Mt because he uses it, but it is not to be found in the earliest tradition.<sup>16</sup>

3. The Mtan v.10ab. The Mtan text does not clarify all the ambiguities of the Mkan one: it informs us neither about the identity of the house owner nor of the one inviting. Mt omitted αὐτοῦ in order to avoid the most obvious confusion. However he still leaves us with a vague text. The use of the absolute gen. after ἐγένετο when followed by a dative is better Gk<sup>17</sup> and originates from Mt's tendency to use such a construction. Instead of κατακεῖσθαι, a term systematically avoided by Mt,<sup>18</sup> we read ἀνακεῖσθαι, an indication that Mt is relying on a text known also to Mk.<sup>19</sup> The semitizing καὶ ἰδοὺ<sup>20</sup> is a well known Mtan tic, but it is in an odd position because Mt always has it at the beginning of a sentence. This suggests that in Mt's understanding the story itself begins here. It is Mt who adds the clarifying ἐλθόντες, which heightens the reference to the fact that it was the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ that held a table-fellowship with Jesus.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Again in Mk.2,6 we find an anticipatory observation for v.8; in 6,31f for v.35b; in 7,2(-4) for v.5; etc.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 72ff.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Bl-D §423(1).

<sup>18</sup> See the Mtan par. to Mk.1,30; 2,4 and 14,3.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. van Iersel, "La vocation" 214.

<sup>20</sup> καὶ ἐγένετο ... καὶ ἰδοὺ is a Semitic art of construction, but also frequent in the LXX. Cf. Beyer, Syntax I,58 ("unhebräisch" but may also be a Septuagentism; also p.60); Schmidt, Rahmen 85 (LXX style).

<sup>21</sup> For some exegetes the Mkan parenthesis ἦσαν γὰρ κτλ. is omitted by Mt and Lk because it is tautological; thus Cadbury, Style 84, and van Iersel, "La vocation" 214. But see the remarks infra and Pesch "Zöllnergastmahl" 72.

4. The Lkan Parallel. The Lkan text, a free paraphrase of his Mkan source (and not Mtan, as indicated by the use of κατακείσθαι), sprinkled with his own vocabulary,<sup>22</sup> is by far the clearest of the three Syn: "d'une clarté anecdotique" observed P. Bonnard.<sup>23</sup> In v.29 Lk clears away all the difficulties posed by the Mkan text: the meal is offered by Levi at the latter's house. However, a new imprecision creeps in: who are the αὐτῶν of v.29c? Does it not presuppose the mention of Jesus and his disciples found in Mk?! Lk wisely omits the reference to ἁμαρτωλοί because he refuses to take the point of view of the Pharisees; rather, he takes that of the early Church where tax-collectors, as we have seen, were not ipso facto considered to be sinners, and he leaves this qualification to be made by the Pharisees themselves. Instead he writes καὶ ἄλλων: they had already repented (v.32!).<sup>24</sup> ὄχλος πολὺς+ gen. is Lk's (only again in Lk. 6,17 and Acts 6,7).<sup>25</sup>

5. The Many Followers: v.15c. In Mk.2,15b we encounter a puzzling expression: ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ.<sup>26</sup> Once again the Mkan pericope is inexplicit as to the persons meant: who are the πολλοί? who followed Jesus? This clause seems to be redactional given its vagueness; its probable purpose is to stress the size of the group and especially to indicate that it followed Jesus. Furthermore, it is absent from Mt and Lk. The fact that many people followed Jesus is

<sup>22</sup> Δοχί is found only in Lk, here and in 14,13; the adj. μεγάλη is not Mkan but frequent in Mt and Lk; ποιεῖν a meal is also found in 14,12 (only again in Mk.6,21) and in 14,16 where we read δεῖπνον μέγα. Thus, v.29a is a complete reworking of Lk's source.

<sup>23</sup> Mt 128.

<sup>24</sup> Grundmann, Mk 132; Lamarche, "L'appel" 134 n.1; Schürmann, Lk 289.

<sup>25</sup> See also 5,15; 7,11.12; 8,4; 9,37; 14,25; as well as Zimmermann, Methodenlehre 102.

<sup>26</sup> The original MS reading of Mk.2,15c-16a is conjectural. Our MSS are not punctuated, hence one could place a period either after πολλοί or after αὐτῷ. Nestle's ed. of the NT (25th ed.) gives the latter, while the latest ed. of the United Bible Society (ed. K. Aland, M. Black, et al.) presents the former. All depends on the sense given to ἠκολούθουν, which seems to me to be that of discipleship (cf. *infra*) so that the punctuation proposed by Nestle would be preferable.

no reason in itself for reclining at table with him. This action is understandable, however, if Mk meant to tie ἀκολουθεῖν with συνανακεισθαι so as to indicate a communitarian relationship (Eucharistic banquet?) and to tie this pericope more closely with the call of Levi, while at the same time broadening the circle of guests/followers. It should be taken as a parenthetical summary that points out that the group of followers/disciples was greater than just the five whom we were told Jesus had so far called: this notice responds to the fact that for the first time we find the term μαθηταῖς. The group of disciples was larger than just the five --an indication of the artificial context of our pericope!-- and when it was placed here Mk saw the need to point out that in fact the group was larger. The two clauses are closely linked by the conj. καί, which has the sense of the relative pronoun οἱ in the manner of Semitic parataxis,<sup>27</sup> as also found in 6,14; 7,19 and 9,4. These clauses must refer to the disciples and not to the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί given that the verb ἀκολουθεῖν, when referring to a "following" of Jesus, is used as a technical term for discipleship.<sup>28</sup> In the impft., as here, it has a sense of permanence which contrasts with the ingressive aor. of v.14 but to which it is related (cf. also 1,18ff; 2,14; 9,38). It can hardly refer to the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί because (1) they were not followers of Jesus, (2) it was already indicated that these were πολλοί, and (3) if τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί is the subject of ἦσαν κτλ. it is too far away from it (interrupted by another subject).<sup>29</sup> Thus, we may conclude that these clauses

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Pernot, *Études* 196, B1-D §471(4) as well as Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 86 n.2; Lohmeyer, *Mk* 55; Taylor, *Mk* 205; Klostermann, *Mk* 26; Rawlinson, *Mk* 29 and 0, it.

<sup>28</sup>To suppose with Gamba, "Considerazioni" 206ff, and the *NTGK* ed. of K.Aland, M.Black, et al. that the primitive reading was ... πολλοί. καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς κτλ. means that the second καὶ is inclusive ("also"). Thus is implied that the Scribes followed Jesus in the same manner the disciples did, i.e. ἠκολούθουν means discipleship for the Scribes also (!) which is the sense this verb has in Mk --he never uses it for the adversaries! Note should be taken that ἠκολούθουν is an impft. and therefore implies a steady (or also habitual) act of following --as a disciple does.

<sup>29</sup>For most scholars this parenthesis refers to the disciples, thus Turner, "Marcan Usage," *JTS* 1925, 147, 238ff, Klostermann, *Mk* 25, Taylor, *Mk* 204f, Gamba, *art.cit.*, 206 n.33. However, for Gould, *Mk* 42, Swete, *Mk* 41, Lohmeyer, *Mk* 55 (tax-collectors who follow Levi's example), Schulz, *Nachfolge* 100 ///

are due to RMk, and refer to the disciples.<sup>30</sup>

6. The Scribes: v.16a. In v.16a the Mkan text has the unique γραμματεῖς τῶν φαρισαίων.<sup>31</sup> The partitive gen. indicates that these are the "scholars" that belonged to the group of the Pharisees, that kept the Law and taught it in strict Pharisaic tradition. It is implied that not all Scribes were aligned with the Pharisees (cf. Acts 23,9: γραμματέων τοῦ μέρους τῶν φαρισαίων). One may wonder whether Mk, who distinguishes Jesus' adversaries in Galilee (mostly Pharisees) from those in Jerusalem (Scribes),<sup>32</sup> does not intend to bridge here the Scribes of v.6ff with the Pharisees who are mentioned hereafter.<sup>33</sup> Noteworthy in this respect is the escalation of hostility: Scribes murmur against Jesus (2,6ff), Scribes and Pharisees address an objection against him and his disciples (2,16), the Pharisees openly speak out their opposition to Jesus (2,18.24). However, this unique description of the Scribes in question reveals a good knowledge of the Palestine of Jesus and suggests its historicity. One can thus presume that it goes back to the origins of this account.<sup>34</sup> In the text of Mt we find mention only of the Pharisees, as would be

---

/// and van Iersel, "La vocation" 225, it refers to the τελῶναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοί. Turner, NTGk III, 348 n.1, proposes the following punctuation: "For they were many. There followed him some scribes of the Pharisees. They noticed him eating ...." But one wonders what happened to the conjunctions.

<sup>30</sup>Thus also Zimmermann, Methodenlehre 178, Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 72, van Iersel, "La vocation" 225, and Boismard, Synopse 112, as well as Gamba, "Considerazioni" 206, 208, who also suggests that ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί was in pre-Mk (209). However, Knox, Sources I, 13, contends that Mk found it in his source, a suggestion that Lohmeyer, Mk 56, had already made.

<sup>31</sup>Nineham, Mk 100, calls it "odd" and Klostermann, Mt 80, "schwieriges". It does not recur in the NT! See further Walker, Heilsgeschichte 17-29. To be noted are the number of changes that different MSS have made (see any critical ed.).

<sup>32</sup>Cf. esp. 3,22 and 7,11. Lk does away with any distinction (see Schreiber, Theologie 182, 212). In Mt they are interchangeable, as Walker, op.cit., 18, 20, shows.

<sup>33</sup>On the relation between Jesus and the Pharisees see esp. the study of W. Beilner, Christus und die Pharisäer, Vienna 1959. In general, Mk refers to the Scribes more often (21x) than to the Pharisees (13x).

<sup>34</sup>See E. Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, II, Leipzig 1907, 320, and Jeremias, Jerusalem, c.X.

expected from him: this is surely a simplification.<sup>35</sup> The Lkan text shows once again a clear dependence on Mk in as much as he has preserved both classes, even though distinguishing them: the Pharisees and their Scribes (cf. Acts 23,9!). ἐγγύζον ( ) λέγοντες, a verb of speech + λέγειν, is quite Lkan.<sup>36</sup>

In Mk.2,16a the reference to the ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ τελῶναι (inverted order!)<sup>37</sup> is due to the final redactor. When Mk added v.15c (ἦσαν γὰρ κτλ.) he had to specify the company of Jesus to which the Scribes objected in order to avoid suggesting that the Scribes objected to the company of disciples. This latter suggestion would have been the case had he used a pronoun.<sup>38</sup> The implication thus is that the pre-Mkan text included neither this clarification nor v.15c which instead probably read μετ' αὐτῶν. This is witnessed also by its absence in Mt and Lk.

7. The Objection: v.16b. In the objection itself, which is addressed to the disciples in all three Syn, an ambiguous ὅτι introduces it in Mk. This is interrogative,<sup>39</sup> quite Mkan (cf. 2,7; 9,11.28; 14,60 [B,W,Ψ,bo]), and betrays popular speech.<sup>40</sup> However, in the unpunctuated text, which is that of our MSS, it could also be thought to be a ὅτι-recitativum in which case we would have either a disapproving remark or a rhetorical question.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>35</sup>Schmidt, Rahmen 86. For Sand, Gesetz 57 n.4, Mt's is correct and Lk did not understand Mk.

<sup>36</sup>Cadbury, Style 170f.

<sup>37</sup>The inversion may have no real significance but be the product of carelessness on the part of RMk. For Swete, Mk 41, and Schulz, Q 384, it shows that Mk wanted to point out that "sinners" was first in their minds; however this view is rightly challenged by Taylor, Mk 106.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 72, and Boismard, Synopse 112. For van Iersel, "La vocation" 214f, it is pre-Mkan and, because it is pleonastic, was omitted by Mt and Lk.

<sup>39</sup>τι ὅτι is found in the Koine, Ferrar and Lake groups, A, Δ; δὲ τι in X,D,W,lat,sa,bo (harmonizing with Mt/Lk?); τι in Θ and syrP.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. Turner, "Marcan Usage," JTS 1926, 58ff, with examples in p.60ff; Pernot, Études 81; Moule, Idiom-Book 159; Bl-D §300(2) who indicates that ὅτι to introduce a question "is especially Markan"; and Turner, NTGK III, 49.

<sup>41</sup>Rawlinson, Mk 29, considers it to be "an exclamation of surprise" and Schürmann, "Sprache" 97f, as well as Pesch, art. cit., 75 n.4, maintain that it is a ὅτι-recitativum. Bl-D §300(2) proposes to read τι ὅ τι, which is conjectural; cf. Sand, Gesetz 57 n.5. Whatever opinion is preferred it is bound to be conjectural. However, it is more probably that it is interrogative, as the MSS changes indicate, as well as Mt/Lk.

The Mtan text is verbatim the same as Mk's with two exceptions: in lieu of the ambiguous  $\delta\tau\iota$  we find  $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\iota$ , as in Lk,<sup>42</sup> and  $\delta\ \delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu$  has been added.<sup>43</sup> Mt thus supplies the subject of the verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu$  and, in customary Mtan style, gives an explicitation. Thus, we observe once more that Mt has used a Mkan text. Luke in turn has reworked the text: the part.  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\epsilon\varsigma$  is a Lkan modality, and so is the use of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  + acc. in lieu of a simple dative,<sup>44</sup> which is better Gk. Instead of referring the objecting question only to Jesus, Lk uses the 2d. person plural,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ , thus including the disciples;<sup>45</sup> such a procedure is found again in 6,2 where Lk is the only one to report the Pharisees' disapproval, because of the plucking of grain on a Sabbath, to the disciples ( $\tau\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\epsilon$ ). Lk betrays a definite community concern. The couplet  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ , which is transmitted here only by Lk, is found quite often and predominantly in the Lkan gospel (5/1/14), so that it can be safely thought to be due to RLk who may be thinking in terms of a Eucharistic table-fellowship. A similar reservation put forward to the disciples, also mentioning eating and drinking (only by Lk!), is found in v.33. It is noteworthy that we find a close par. to v.30 in Lk.15,1f.

8. The Sayings of v.17. It is in this last verse that we find the  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$ -logion, by way of climax, preceded by another logion. Both logia serve as a response by Jesus to the objection made to his eating with tax-collectors and sinners. These two logia are reported verbatim in all three gospels, with a change in verb tense by Lk in the 2d. logion ( $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\upsilon\theta\alpha$ ) and a reference to Hos.6,6 in Mt.

<sup>42</sup>It should not be thought that because it appears in both Mt and Lk, against Mk, it is therefore original, but rather that both have changed it for what would be the natural way of expressing a question. Note that Mt also changed Mk's  $\delta\tau\iota$ -interrogative of 2,7; 9,11.28. It is difficult to think that Mk would have changed an unambiguous  $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\iota$  for the ambiguous  $\delta\tau\iota$ , but rather the inverse would be logical. Cf. van Iersel, "La vocation" 215, and Boismard, Synopse 112.

<sup>43</sup> $\Delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  is quite Mtan (6/2/2); also added by Mt to Mk.12,28. Cf. Trilling, Wahre Israel 36 +n.86. According to E. Best, Temptation 71f, it is Mkan!

<sup>44</sup>Cf. Cadbury, Style 203.

<sup>45</sup>However, it remains unclear whether  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  refers only to the disciples or it includes Jesus as well. The singular is found in C, the Ferrar and Lake groups, c,f,l,q,r<sup>2</sup>,vg,syrP, sa,bo,eth,arm.

The introduction to the response has been slightly reshaped by each final redactor. The Mkan text again has the historical pte.: λέγει + dat. As H.-W. Kuhn observed, καί + part. aor. + λέγει + dat. of object is pre-Mkan.<sup>46</sup> Mt has omitted the superfluous mention of Jesus and again changed the historical pte. for a simple aor.<sup>47</sup> The reference to Hos.6,6 in Mt is most probably due to Rmt; it is found again in 12,7. In both occasions Mt attempts to tie the reference to Hos. with a logion that follows by way of γάρ, and in both cases it serves the purpose of supporting and legitimating the 2d. logion on the OT, as is well within Mt's outlook of Jesus as fulfillment of the OT.<sup>48</sup> The Lukan text again shows more changes. Lk introduces the logia with his customary ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς + acc.<sup>49</sup> He changes ἰσχύοντες to ὑγιαίνοντες in the first logion,<sup>50</sup> a more precise term, as he is prone to employ.<sup>51</sup> The two terms are variants of the same Aram./Hebr. word: ܡܕܢܐܝܢܐ.<sup>52</sup> Finally, Lk has changed the aor. to the pft. of the verb ἔρχομαι in the 2d. logion, as he did also in 7,33.34 (q.v.),<sup>53</sup> and explicates καλέσαι by adding εἰς μετάνοιαν, a well known aspect of Lkan theology.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>46</sup>Sammlungen 149.

<sup>47</sup>Cf. Zimmermann, Methodenlehre 97: Mt changed Mk's λέγει for εἶπεν some 20 times.

<sup>48</sup>Strecker, Weg 135; Zimmermann, op.cit., 97; van Iersel, "La vocation" 215; Boismard, Synopse 113. The tendency to multiply ἄλθον-sayings is already observable in the analogous logion created by the Ebionites, reported by Epiphanius in Haer. 30,16: "I have come (ἄλθον) to abolish the sacrifices, and if you do not cease to sacrifice my wrath will not depart from you." This logion should also be approached to Mt.5,17.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Cadbury, Style 170, 202, and Zimmermann, op.cit., 102f. Both Mk and Lk introduce the response by καί, while Mt has changed it to ὁ δέ. In the introduction itself the dependence of Lk on the Mkan text is evident: both begin with καί, mention Jesus, and the addressees are referred to by a pronoun (αὐτοῖς). Lk changed to ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν + acc.

<sup>50</sup>The verb ὑγιαίνειν is used only by Lk: 7,10 and 15,27.

<sup>51</sup>Lk precisifies Mk's 1,28.38; 3,14; Mt's 4,6; 5,46; etc. See Pernot, Études 4f and, Cadbury, Style 96f.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. Jeremias in TLZ 74(1949), col.532 and Black, Aramaic 196.

<sup>53</sup>Lk changed the aor. of the verb in Mk.5,30; 14,48; Mt. 11,7.8.9.18.19, all to the pft. W wrote the pft. in Mk's text and D the aor. in Lk's.

<sup>54</sup>See also 8,12; 15,7 and 17,3b. The cognate μετάνοια (2/1/5+6), μετανόειν (5/2/9+5) is more frequent in Lk than in any other gospel. See R. Michiels, "La conception lucanienne de la conversion," ETL 41(1965), 42-78, esp. 54f. C, the Koine and Ferrar groups, vg, sa, bo, added εἰς μετάνοιαν in Mk; these plus Θ and syr<sup>s</sup> added it to Mt's text.

## B. Searching the Oldest (Reachable) Form.<sup>55</sup>

We have already pointed out that the introduction has the earmarks of being a redactional phrase in view of relating this pericope with the call of Levi. Originally it must have had an existence separate from the vocation of Levi and must have begun with the introduction of the actors. This is done only in v.15b and Mt's καὶ ἰδοὺ, which he always uses at the beginning of a pericope. Both are quite indicative in this sense. It is very plausible that the spatial frame was the house of Levi, and that it had been explicitly mentioned together with the participants.<sup>56</sup>

1. The Original Introduction. If one holds that the story originally began with v.15a, as some exegetes do, one runs against the following difficulties: (1) as an independent pericope (at least from the call of Levi) it could hardly have begun as vaguely as v.15a does; (2) the present introduction presumes one knows who the person(s) referred to by the pronouns are; however, v.15b introduces them as if one did not know them yet!<sup>57</sup> As we already indicated, the classification of the tax-collectors with sinners could hardly have been the view of the early Church, and therefore that of the earliest tradition, for which tax-collectors were not considered ipso facto as being lawless people --as they were in Judaism. Thus, originally the reference to sinners (which is the standpoint of the objectors, i.e. the Jews) must have been absent. It would only at a later stage in tradition, when Jewish concepts were foreign to the Christians of Gentile origin, that τελῶναι had to be added to make sure that the content of the objection was understood and the pericope still serve its paradigmatic pur-

<sup>55</sup>To my knowledge, Pesch and Boismard are the only scholars who have so far attempted to recover the earliest form.

<sup>56</sup>Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 16, suspects that it began εἰς οἶκον κτλ. Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 71f, thinks that the pre-Mkan text mentioned Levi in lieu of and in the position of our present αὐτοῦ, in v.15a.

<sup>57</sup>Versus Pesch, art.cit., 71, whose argument that the actors could not have been named in v.15a because it would have brought about confusion is not convincing. It could easily have read καὶ γίνεται κατακείσθαι Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ (or Λευὶ) καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο αὐτοῖς.



pose (cf. infra).<sup>58</sup>

2. The Objectors and the Objection: v.16. It is difficult to determine whether the original text read οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν φαρισαίων or if it had a simpler form -and which.<sup>59</sup> Since this is a unique description, changed by Mt and Lk as well as in many MSS, historical presumption dictates taking it as having been present in the earliest moment of the transmission of this account.

The actual objection must have excluded the reference to "sinners," as in v.15b. Such a reference was as unnecessary in the mouth of a Jew as for the early Judeo-Christians: in a Jewish mentality it was understood that a tax-collector was a sinner.

3. The Logia of v.17. It is at once evident that the two logia of v.17 have been artificially placed together since there is neither a direct grammatical<sup>60</sup> nor a "content" connection between them. The second logion does not follow on the first as a response, but only as a theological explicitation. Furthermore, the theme of curing and that of inviting do not harmonize well: the first one is exclusive (only sick ones can be cured); the second one is not exclusive a fortiori (οὐκ-ἀλλά is dialectic! cf. infra) since the just also have need of Jesus in order to enter the Kingdom. It is also unusual to find more than one logion climaxing a paradigm. At first sight the logion about the physician does not seem to constitute an adequate answer to the objectors, while the second apparently does: the objection concerned Jesus' company with sinners. While the first logion is formulated in impersonal terms, the second one is personal, having the form of a self-justification and the tone of a response-reaction. Yet, in spite of their parallel-

<sup>58</sup>Similarly Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 73f. At that stage the conj. καί may well have had an epexegetic sense (so also Bonnard, Mt 129).

<sup>59</sup>Oxyrh. 1224 reads like Lk does: γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι. The Koine, Lake and Ferrar groups, A,C,D,Θ,syrP.h,sa,bo,it,vg, arm,eth, read οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι.

<sup>60</sup>It is asyndetic, Mk being fond of such constructions. Cf. Turner, "Marcan Usage," JTS 1927, 15f.

ism,<sup>61</sup> one of these logia was originally absent in this pericope.

The logion of v.17a can hardly have had an independent existence<sup>62</sup> because it needs a frame in order to make sense and to refer to Jesus. If we suppose that it did have an isolated existence then we have to find a plausible reason that would explain the preservation of such a neutral saying.<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, the logion of v.17b could have had an independent existence,<sup>64</sup> as is evidenced by its use in Lk.9,56a (q.v.); 19,10 (a logion that resembles it), and the echo it found in 1 Tim.1,15; Barn.v,9; 2 Clem. ad Cor.ii,4; Justin, Apol.i,15 and the Didache iv,10. In fact, v.17b by itself has a definite paradigmatic value that would justify its preservation by the early Church. It should also be noted that while v.17a would call for v.17b as an added explanation, the logion of v.17b hardly calls for that of v.17a. We can also observe that, in the controversies that follow, Jesus' response is also in terms of a wisdom saying (cf. Mk.2,19ff.27; 3,4). Jesus often used meshalim!<sup>65</sup> Finally, it should be noticed

<sup>61</sup>Both have an οὐ(κ)-ἀλλά construction, and a synonimic parallelism between healthy-sick and righteous-sinners exists.

<sup>62</sup>Schürmann, Lk 290, 292. To the contrary Haenchen, Weg 111; Nineham, Mk 98; Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 15; van Iersel, "La vocation" 218, and Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 75. P.Oxyrh.1, 1.31-36, and the Gospel of Thomas, logion 31 --both being identical-- have combined Lk.4,24 and 5,31: "A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither does a physician work cures on those who know him."

<sup>63</sup>We find refrains using the figure of the physician in Greek literature (Pausanias, ap. Plutarch, Apophth.Lacon.230f; Diog.Laert., Antisth.vi,6; Stoebus, Floril.iii,462.14; Artemidor ii,57; iii,39; iv,22; Dio Chrysost., Leg.orat.viii,5; Plutarch, V.Phoc.x,5), in the P.Oxyrh.1 and 1224; Gnostic (eg. Gospel of Truth 35, 1.30-36; Pistis Sophia c.100, p.161, l. 32ff; Gospel of Thomas, logion 31), Mandeian (G.R. II,ii,1.14ff) and Samaritan (M. Margah, iv §7: "He [Moses] was a good physician, healing and giving reward.") literatures, the Talmud (eg. jTaan.66d), as well as the OT (eg. Job 13,4). See also J. Wettstein, Nouum Testamentum Graecum, I (Graz 1962) ad loc.

<sup>64</sup>Gaechter, Mt 294; Schürmann, Lk 292; Boismard, Synopse 113; Dodd, Parables 117f, and Bultmann, ST 163. To the contrary Pesch, art.cit. 75. Van Iersel, art.cit. 218, hesitates but finally concludes that it must be reckoned that "[v.17b] exista dans la tradition comme un logion isolé."

<sup>65</sup>See esp. Bultmann, ST 104f.

that v.17b makes no reference to the *τελῶναι*.

From the point of view of content, v.17a fits better as a response-reaction than v.17b does. In the logion about the physician the emphasis is on the going to see the sick, i.e. to those who really need him, as behooves a physician to do.<sup>66</sup> The story is also in terms of Jesus' going to a meal to which he is invited, as a physician goes to a sick one when invited to do so. It is an attitude contrary to that of the Pharisees, who do not go out of their way to save a sinner for fear of defilement. Different to the attitude paradigmatically narrated in our pericope is that presupposed in v.17b, where the stress is on *καλέσαι*, i.e. to call, where the one calling maintains a rather passive attitude, waiting for the sinner to come, respond, move towards him. As van Iersel pointed out, v.17a provides a reason: it is to the sick that Jesus goes out, to those who are in dire need of him and show to be receptive, which is not the picture painted by v.17b.<sup>67</sup> Still from the point of view of content, v.17b barely fits v.15b-16, which is about an "earthly" mean and not a question of a call to discipleship. But, in this story, where Jesus is not the one making the invitation, *καλεῖν*, referring to sinners, means to call to turn from the state of sinner to that of just, i.e. to discipleship (in the broadest sense).<sup>68</sup>

One could conceive v.17b as having been introduced by association of ideas, constituting an *inclusio* with v.14, where we find a concrete example of one called to follow Jesus. In fact, *καλεῖν* has more affinity with v.14 than with v.15b-16. Furthermore, of two unconnected sentences, as are v.17a and v.17b, is it not logical to think that the last of these is the one added later?

---

<sup>66</sup>We should keep in mind that it is figurative speech, a *mashal*, and therefore we should not get lost in details as Haenchen, Weg 110: "Ein solches Fest ist keine Seelsorge"; or Lohmeyer, Mk 56: does a physician heal by eating with sinners? These miss the point. Cranfield, Mk 107, rightly observed that, "For Jesus to refuse to have dealings with the disreputable would be as absurd as for a doctor to refuse to have to do with the sick."

<sup>67</sup>"La vocation" 218.

<sup>68</sup>The verb *καλεῖν* can mean an invitation to a meal (eg. in Lk.7,39; 14,7.9.16.17; etc.) as well as a call to conversion and discipleship (eg. Mt.4,21). If *καλεῖν* = to invite to a meal, then it is implied that Jesus was the inviter and that the ///

To have Jesus speak of sinners referring to the tax-collectors who sat at table with him would imply that for him, and not just for the Jews, they are also sinners. It must be remembered that "sinner" in the lips of Jesus meant the not converted --thus Lk specifies it by adding εἰς μετάνοιαν. This differs from the conception of a sinner in the mind of a Jew who took it as synonymous with someone who did not observe the Law, as is the sense of τελώνης in v.16b. Hence, the understanding of "sinner" in v.16b and in v.17b differs.<sup>69</sup> In view of this distinction one can suspect that the addition of v.17b was made at the same time when ἁμαρτωλοί was added in v.15b and v.16b, i.e. by pre-Mk.<sup>70</sup>

The pre-Mkan redactor probably did not consider the objection raised against Jesus as adequately refuted by v.17a and therefore added v.17b, which could have existed in a sort of "florigelium". Mt adds the reference to Hos.6,6 for a similar reason. The purpose for choosing the logion of v.17b may have been the same as that for writing v.15a, viz. to create a close connection with the call of Levi.

Thus, we conclude that originally the pericope ended with the logion of v.17a.<sup>71</sup> Mt seems to have been aware that the pericope originally did not include the final logion: he inserts the reference to Hos. between them.<sup>72</sup>

Summarizing the history of the composition of our pericope we have the following picture:

/// meal must be understood in eschatological terms and not as an ordinary one (Schürmann, Lk 292) as that of Mk.2,15b-16.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Schürmann, Lk 292 +n.33.

<sup>70</sup>Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 75, holds that to say that v.17a is original is to assume that v.16b was a question, against which he argues in n.4. However, it seems to me that if v.16b is a question (ὅτι -interrogative) v.17b would serve as a better answer than v.17a.

<sup>71</sup>Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 8, Lohmeyer, Mk 56, Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 15f, and Pesch, art.cit. 74f, hold that the logion of v.17a is a later addition. Lagrange, Mk 45, Allen, Mt 90, and Carrington, Mk 64, imply that both logia in their opinion originally were an integral part of the pericope.

<sup>72</sup>Unfortunately the text of P.Oxyhr.1224, frag.2 verso, col.ii, is not much of a help here because it is damaged at the bottom and ends with the first half of v.17a. On the value and importance of this papyrus see the discussion of Boismard, Synopse 112.

- v.15 a. καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ,  
 b. καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ  
 συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.  
 c. ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ.
- v.16 a. καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν φαρισαίων ἰδόντες  
 ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν  
 b. ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,  
ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;
- v.17 a. καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὅτι]  
 οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ  
 ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες  
 b. οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς.

Key: ———: pre-Mkan addition; ———: Mkan addition or change.

### C. Form and Formative Factors.<sup>73</sup>

#### 1. Literary Constitutive Form.

a. The Pericope. Mk.2,15-17 par. is a conflict story, as the three essential elements that structure it indicate: an event (v.15b) occasions an objection (v.16) and a response (v.17).<sup>74</sup> As most controversy stories, it was preserved for its paradigmatic value.<sup>75</sup>

The original extent of this story is disputed. For some v.15-17 constituted a unity from the beginning;<sup>76</sup> for others it began only with v.16,<sup>77</sup> while some think that the whole was constructed in order to introduce the logion of v.17b.<sup>78</sup> However, most exegetes do agree that our pericope had at its

<sup>73</sup>A summary of opinions will be found in Pesch, "Zöllner-gastmahl" 66ff.

<sup>74</sup>The same schema is found also in Mk.2,1ff.15ff.23ff. See further Daube, Judaism 170ff and Bultmann, ST 39-54.

<sup>75</sup>Van Iersel, "La vocation" 217; Taylor, Mk 203; Lohmeyer, Mk 57.

<sup>76</sup>Pesch, art.cit. 64; Kuhn, Sammlungen 58, and Schulz, Q 384.

<sup>77</sup>That is the opinion of van Iersel, art.cit. 220, 225; Branscomb, Mk 48; and Taylor, Mk 203.

<sup>78</sup>Thus Dibelius, Tradition 64 n.1; Bultmann, ST 18; Lohmeyer, Mk 56f; Haenchen, Weg 110; and Nineham, Mk 98.

origin an existence independent from the call of Levi.<sup>79</sup> The parallelism with Lk.15,1-7 is noteworthy and instructive:

Mk.2,15-17	Lk.15,1-7
15b. <u>τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ</u> recline at table with J.	1. οἱ <u>τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ</u> come to hear Jesus.
16. οἱ <u>γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων</u> (Lk: οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμ.) (Lk: ἐγόγγυζον... λέγοντες ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;	2. οἱ <u>Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς</u> <u>διεγόγγυζον... λέγοντες</u> <u>ὅτι οὗτος ἁμαρτωλοὺς προεδέχεται</u> <u>καὶ συνέσθιει αὐτοῖς</u>
17a. Response: parabolic say. 3-6.	5. Response: a parable
17b. logion: οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς  (Lk: εἰς μετάνοιαν)	7. logion: χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανουῶντι ἢ ἐπὶ 99 δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας

The logion of Lk.15,7 has been thoroughly reworked by RLk and probably was influenced by the logion of Mk.2,17b. Furthermore, many a redactional trait finds confirmation in the same parable. The similarity in the introductions adds weight to our conclusion that our pericope originally began with v.15b.

b. The Logia. The logion of v.17a has the form of a wisdom saying. The content is that of a short mashal.<sup>81</sup> The second logion, v.17b, has the form of a clarifying corrective about an assumed mission. Its outer form is that of a dialectic negative statement of fact (οὐκ-ἀλλά, as in v.17a) where the negative statement is not a categorical, all-exclusive negative but a Semitic way of strengthening the positive statement which should be read "not so much A as B."<sup>82</sup> Such a relative negation is understandable from its polemic tone and also its subject matter.

<sup>79</sup>To the contrary Knox, Sources I, 13. But our pericope is no longer concerned with Levi!

<sup>80</sup>Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II, 174 (a "Gleichnis"); Dodd, Parables 117; Filson, Mk 119; Johnson, Mk 63.

<sup>81</sup>See esp. H. Kruse's study "Die 'Dialektische Negation' als Semitisches Idiom," VT 4(1954), 385-400, and Zerwick, Greek §445. That is also the observation made by Cranfield, Mk 106 and Gaechter, Mt 294. The absolute negation would read μᾶλλον... ἢ... (eg. Mt.15,24) or simply οὐ μὴ. If the meaning were "I came only for the sinners" then it would have read ἦλθον καλέσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς μόνους (cf. Mt.4,10; 12,4; 17,8; 24,36; etc.).

## 2. Situational Formative Evolution.

The original "setting in life" (Sitz im Leben) of our pericope is to be sought in the concrete reality of Jesus' frequent dealings with people thought by Jews to be sinners.<sup>82</sup> We know that more than once he sat at table with this class of people.<sup>83</sup> Our pericope has a historical core: it goes back to Jesus' meals with "outcasts". This, coupled with the fact that Jesus was often confronted by Jews in authority on account of his "revolutionary" behavior, are at the basis of our pericope.<sup>84</sup> The problem that began at Jesus' time was still very actual in the early Church so that, the confrontation that Jesus' action provoked served as a paradigm for problems lived in the early Church: did Jesus also come to call "sinners" into the community? ought we to have dealings and meal-fellowship with "sinners"? These and related problems found an answer in this paradigmatic story.<sup>85</sup> The reason for the preservation of the story of Jesus eating with "sinners" and his confrontation with Jewish authority on this account, must have been precisely their paradigmatic (or exemplary) value as well as the Church's interest in the recurrent problematic question of table-fellowship.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>82</sup>The pte. art. cit. suggests a habitual or repeated behavior.

<sup>83</sup>See the epithet addressed to Jesus in Lk. 7, 34; 15, 2; Mt. 11, 19 ("friend of tax-collectors and sinners"); as well as Lk. 18, 10ff; 19, 7; and Mt 21, 31f.

<sup>84</sup>Jeremias, NTTh I, 121; Schniewind, Mk 61f. I do not agree with the opinion expressed in some circles that the pericope was created by the early Church, as Bultmann, ST 18, Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 16, and Haenchen, Weg 110, as well as Dibelius, Tradition 64 n.1 and Lohmeyer, Mk 57. There is a historical core, many of the details having been added later and others forgotten. It is not an "ideal" scene either, as Nineham, Mk 100, thinks, and which Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 67, 76, disproves. It is not the same to say that it was invented as to say that it was shaped on the basis of a historical minimum (cf. Taylor, Mk 203; Knox, Sources I, 14, and Boismard, Synopse 112), which is probably what actually occurred.

<sup>85</sup>Schweizer, Mk 34, and Pesch, art. cit. 83, think that the question of acceptance of those who have sinned after baptism was also in play. This was rightly refuted by van Iersel, "La vocation" 218 n.16.

<sup>86</sup>Cf. Acts 11, 3; Gal. 2, 11ff; Eph. 2, 19; 1 Cor. 11; Rom. 14; etc. See also Taylor, Mk 204 and Kuhn, Sammlungen 84, 92.

The fact that the historical bones of our pericope were given flesh by the concerns of the early Church can be seen in a number of details. The question is addressed to the disciples (=leaders of the community<sup>87</sup>) and it is Jesus who responds. The Pharisees, traditional adversaries of Jesus, are the personification of the Law.<sup>88</sup> Among the Judeo-Christian members of the early community there was for a long time a tendency to fall back on the legalisms of the Law (cf. Mt.5,17ff, q.v.). The paradigmatic shaping of this pericope can also be observed in the absence of a number of precisions: who gives the meal and where? how, when, and why did the objectors come? were they present at the meal? when, where, to whom,<sup>89</sup> and why does Jesus give a reply? etc.<sup>90</sup> These details were of no interest in a story which had a minimal historical core and was shaped in view of a paradigmatic and catechetical purpose. The pericope, as we possess it today, reflects a problematic within a predominantly Judeo-Christian community,<sup>91</sup> some members asking themselves if and to what extent they should be concerned with Gentiles. The decisive "setting in life", which is to be sought in this community, may be precised.

Our pericope received its defining shape at a time when the τελωῶναι were no longer thought of as sinners<sup>92</sup> and the ma-shal (v.17a) was no longer clear. For this reason the epexe-

<sup>87</sup>Bultmann, ST 49; Lohmeyer, Mk 55; Kuhn, Sammlungen 59; Boismard, Synopse 113.

<sup>88</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Mk 55; Schweizer, Mk 35 and Kuhn, op.cit. 60.

<sup>89</sup>The αὐτοῖς could refer to the disciples, in which case it would hardly be a conflict story. Cf. van Iersel, "La vocation" 222f and Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 77.

<sup>90</sup>The absence of these precisions led Schmidt, Rahmen 85, Bultmann, ST 18 + n.3, and others to conclude that v.15f were created in function of the logia.

<sup>91</sup>Lohmeyer, Mk 55; Schweizer, Mk 35; Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 39; Kuhn, op.cit. 84f, van Iersel, art.cit. 219 n.6 and Boismard, Synopse 113. Dibelius, Tradition 68, denies any such "setting in life" was at work, in opposition to Bultmann who saw the origin of our pericope there.

<sup>92</sup>τελωῶναι may have served as a prototype of all those people who were considered by Jews as sinners. On the other hand, "sinners" in the Judeo-Christian mind meant "pagans/Gentiles", or those who resemble them, as we can observe in Mt. 18,17 and esp. Lk.6,32ff which reads ἀμαρτωλοί, while the par. Mt.5,47 reads ἐθνικοί. See Pesch, art.cit. 83; Kuhn, op.cit. 98.



getic ἁμαρτωλοί and the logion of v.17b were added.<sup>93</sup> It was a community made up of Judeo and Gentile Christians and the break with Judaism was not yet complete. The temptation of Judeo-Christians to fall back on their old categories and distinctions of people continued to be present.<sup>94</sup> The main problem however, was probably that of relations between Judeo and Gentile Christians around a common table-fellowship.<sup>95</sup> The dilemma was posed by the former who must have been influenced by the attacks/objections coming from official Judaism. Thus, we find a community taking a position and finding a justification for it in the paradigmatic behavior of Jesus, as is the case with the other conflict stories in Mk.2,1-3,6.

#### D. Authenticating Criteria and the Logion of Mk.2,17b par.

Since Mk.2,17b is the first logion that we subject to a critical examination in view of determining the probability of authenticity, i.e. of its going back to Jesus and its being ipsissima vox, if not ipsissima verba, I shall briefly introduce each criterion used. Many different criteria have been proposed and discussed by scholars in the last decades. The most thorough evaluation and critique of all the criteria proposed has been, to my knowledge, that done by N.J. McEleney in his article "Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7:1-23."<sup>96</sup>

Two warnings seem to me necessary: (1) the criteria in question are not "proofs of" but indications of a probability that a logion may go back to Jesus, and (2) no conclusion can be drawn on the basis of only one criterion, but on that of the ensemble of criteria. It is always the oldest reachable form of the logion under study that will be analyzed. It is

<sup>93</sup>Note that the logion of v.17b no longer speaks of τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν -- only of sinners!

<sup>94</sup>Zimmermann, Methodenlehre 178; Kuhn, Sammlungen 84. The impft. ἐλεγον suggests that the charge was repeatedly made, and that the Judeo-Christians had not yet given up hopes of "converting" their brethren to the ways of Jewish law. The objection itself is not an accusation as much as an attempt to have relations changed.

<sup>95</sup>Cf. Acts 11,3 and Gal.2,11ff; as well as van Iersel, "La vocation" 219 n.6 and Kuhn, op.cit. 92.

<sup>96</sup>CBQ 34(1972), esp. 431-448. I wish to express my gratitude to Neil McEleney for all the help he generously granted me on this question during our stay in Jerusalem.

important to bear in mind that the fact that a logion did not constitute an integral part of a pericope from the beginning, or that it seems to have existed in isolation, does not by itself imply that it was "invented" or created by the early Church. There is no a priori reason why it could not go back to the historical Jesus.

1. The Criterion of Multiple Attestation. The probability of authenticity of a logion is enhanced whenever it is attested in different writings (Syn, Jn, etc.) and also in different literary forms (parables, conflict stories, etc.).<sup>97</sup> The fact that several (thought to be) independent witnesses exist is no proof of authenticity; that begs the question of authenticity at the source of these witnesses. The absence of witnesses is no destructive "proof". More reliable than the multiplicity of separate writings is that of literary forms, especially when a particular form has definite traits of its oral transmission (tradition). Of these the most trustworthy are the simple narratives and especially the parables.

The logion of Mk.2,17b (par.) is not directly attested elsewhere in the NT, but finds an echo in the dogmatic formulation of 1 Tim.1,15b (Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι). Early Patristic tradition also transmitted it: Justin Martyr, Apol. i,15; the Didache iv,10, and Barnabas v,9. The same idea, though in different terms, is expressed in the logia of Lk.9,56a (q.v.) and 19,10. Jesus' concern for the ἁμαρτωλοί, i.e. those rejected by Judaism as sinners, is attested as much in the parables (eg. Lk.15,4-7.11-32; 18,9-13), sayings (Mt.11,19; 21,31; Lk.15,1f; 19,10; etc.) as in other conflict stories (eg. Mk.2,6-10; 3,4; Lk.7,37-50), i.e. in several literary forms. The motif here verbally expressed has been preserved by tradition and is well attested in our Gospels: Jesus had frequent contact and dealings with "sinners", and not seldom was he rebuked for it! How often do we read "go and sin no more"! This logion preserves at least "the spirit of Jesus".<sup>98</sup>

<sup>97</sup>See McEleney, "Criteria" 433-436.

<sup>98</sup>Taylor, Mk 207; cf. also Lohmeyer, Mk 58, McArthur, "Basic Issues" 48, and McEleney, art.cit. 134.

2. The Criterion of Language. Behind this criterion lies the understanding that a logion containing Semitic modes of speech has a good probability of faithfully repeating a saying that was first formulated in Hebrew, or more probably in Aramaic, and in Palestine, i.e. of having originated with Jesus.<sup>99</sup> However, as N.J. McEleney warns, Semitisms "may (even) be products of a Semitic mind (other than Jesus') using Greek directly" or of the early Christians of Palestine.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, almost any saying (in Greek) can be somehow retroverted into a Semitic language. An expression that is a literal translation of a Hebrew or an Aramaic expression points to a high degree of probability that it is quite ancient.

A possible Semitic origin of our logion may be suspected in the terminology employed, understood in the light of our previous observations. Thus ἡλθον = תָּבִיא, δίκαιοι = (י)דִּיקָיִא (a Jewish theologumenon) and ἁμαρτωλοί probably has in the background the חַיִּי or the חַיִּי-חַיִּי. The dialectic negation οὐκ - ἀλλά (... אִלָּא ... אִלָּא), frequent in Rabbinic writings, is a Semitism.<sup>101</sup> The verb καλεῖν also has in Hebr. and Aram. the two meanings we pointed out for the Gk word, viz. "to call" and "to invite". The logion would read in Aramaic:<sup>102</sup>

אִלָּא תָּבִיא דִּיקָיִא חַיִּי-חַיִּי

A Semitic background is therefore not at all impossible for this logion, especially in view of the fact that the meaning the different terms have is more common in the Jewish than in the Greco-Hellenistic world.

3. The Criterion of Coherence. By this criterion we intend to determine whether our logion corresponds to and is consistent with the characteristic teaching and behavior of Jesus.<sup>103</sup> The conditions and circumstances to which the logion in question

<sup>99</sup>Cf. McEleney, "Criteria" 438ff, where he points out the weaknesses of this criterion. Since it is difficult to determine with certitude whether Hebrew was also spoken in some circumstances, I will keep both possibilities open. See the most recent study by J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.," CBQ 32(1970), 501-531.

<sup>100</sup>Art.cit. 439f.

<sup>101</sup>See n.81 above, esp. Kruse's article.

<sup>102</sup>From the transl. of F. Delitzsch, the Hebr. would have run: אִלָּא תָּבִיא דִּיקָיִא חַיִּי-חַיִּי.

<sup>103</sup>See McEleney, art.cit. 443f.

alludes (religious, social, etc.) must also be consistent with those we know surrounded Jesus.

The logion of Mk.2,17b par. is undoubtedly coherent with Jesus' teaching and outlook on man. We find an echo in the parables of Lk.15, esp. v.7 (par. Mt.18,13), v.10 and 11-25 (see also Lk.19,1-10; Mt.9,36ff; 10,6; 15,24ff). It expresses in one sentence Jesus' universal concern for the rejected and outcasts. The pte. ἐσθίει indicates that Jesus had "the bad habit" of sitting at table and dealing with "sinners", as Lk. 15,2b clearly indicates: οὗτος ἁμαρτωλούς προσδέχεται καὶ συν-εσθίει αὐτοῖς (note the pte. tenses!).

4. The Criterion of Distinctiveness (or Discontinuity). This criterion seeks to answer the question whether or not the logion is a product of the early Church. It is compared with the known teaching of contemporary Judaism and the theology developed by the early Church as well as the preoccupations that new circumstances brought about. This is, in my opinion, one of the most useful criteria, yet one which presupposes more information than is available and discernable to us.<sup>104</sup>

Our logion could hardly have been completely invented by the early Church: (1) she would hardly have come up with the idea of dealing with those whom Judaism considered to be sinners if Jesus did not say it and give the example first, and (2) if it were due to the Church, would it not have been more precise and added a specifying object --as Lk felt it necessary to do by adding εἰς μετάνοιαν?<sup>105</sup> Thus, at least the core of our logion must have had its origin in Jesus himself. However, there are grounds for doubting that its present formulation is due to Jesus.

The negative clause, with the theologically pregnant δὲ καὶ οὐκ, giving rise to a dialectic statement, serves to under-

---

<sup>104</sup>McEleney, "Criteria" 44Off. This criterion is again discussed by D. Lührmann, "Die Frage nach Kriterien für ursprüngliche Jesusworte - eine Problemskizze," in Jésus aux Origines de la Christologie, Louvain 1975, 59-72.

<sup>105</sup>Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 80, and van Iersel, "La vocation" 224, ask whether the early Christians would have excluded themselves from the care of the Lord by putting in Jesus' mouth the affirmation of the negative clause. However, this forgets that it is dialectic, not categorical; see Knox, Sources I, 14, Lohmeyer, Mk 56, and Haenchen, Weg 111.

line the positive clause in view of compelling to missionary activity --especially among a Judeo-Christian majority. Furthermore, we must reckon with the fact that v.17b is a programmatic statement which does not fail to give the impression of looking back at the totality of Jesus' public ministry.<sup>106</sup> Since this logion cannot go back to a time when the Pharisees and other pious Jews were thought by Christians to be false δίκαιοι, it must have originated at a time when the true δίκαιοι were indeed the Jewish πῶποι.<sup>107</sup> It does not derive from Judaism for it is contrary to their generally-held exclusivism.

Taking into account all the considerations we have exposed, it follows that Mk.2,17b is a very ancient logion, the idea therein expressed having originated in Jesus himself. However, its present stylized programmatic formulation is more probably due to the early Church than to Jesus himself, i.e. here we have the ipsissima vox but not ipsissima verba Iesu.<sup>108</sup>

#### E. From the Earliest Tradition to the Final Redaction.

##### 1. The ἡλθον-saying in the Redaction-history of Mark.

As R. Pesch pointed out,<sup>109</sup> the main idea developed in Mk.1,1-3,6 is Jesus' ἐξουσία. In 2,1-3,6 this authority is shown precisely in the conflict stories where Jesus is insistent on the liberation of man from unnecessary ties, from false emphases placed on the Law, and from sin (=sickness!). But it does not stop there: Jesus calls those who want to be liberated to follow him, and those who are open to such an invitation are rewarded with a table-fellowship with him.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>106</sup>The fact that the other οὐκ-ἀλλὰ formulated ἡλθον-logia hardly go back to Jesus, casts a shadow of doubt on the authenticity of Mk.2,17b. Furthermore, "to call sinners" suggests an understanding of Jesus as σωτήρ, as does the universalist outlook of the logion.

<sup>107</sup>For Jesus the δίκαιοι=sincere pious Jews, and the ἀμαρτωλοί=the γὰρ-πῶποι, as in contemporary Judaism. In the early Church the applications and connotations changed: δίκαιοι=the Christians, while the Jews, who rejected Jesus, are the false δίκαιοι, and the ἀμαρτωλοί are those not yet converted.

<sup>108</sup>Most exegetes deem it to be an authentic saying of Jesus. Bultmann, ST 93; Dibelius, Tradition 64; Haenchen, Weg 111; Schweizer, Mk 35; Kuhn, Sammlungen 59 (who in p.82f concedes that it may go back to Jesus), take it to be post-Paschal.

<sup>109</sup>"Zöllnergastmahl" 86.

<sup>110</sup>See Perrin, Rediscovering 102ff, and Tödt, SM 308.

a. The Pericope. Once we observe that in its earliest written form v.15b-17a most probably followed v.1-12 (Jesus' power to cure and forgive sins),<sup>111</sup> we realize that the original point being made here was in terms of forgiveness of sins, i.e. of curing the sick. Strict Pharisaism forbade holding meals with sinners due to laws of purity.<sup>112</sup> For Jesus the sinners were not "contaminating people" from whom one ought to flee, but sick ones to whom one ought to go in order to cure them. That is to say, Jesus refused to take the Pharisaic (representative) legalistic point of view but decisively took that of the loving God who seeks out the sinner.

By placing the story of the call of Levi before our pericope, the pre-Mkan redactor points out the close relation between the act of welcoming Jesus' invitation to follow him (which presupposes conversion!) and the ensuing table-fellowship. The Mkan redactor further stresses the point when he adds that those who sat at table with Jesus ἦσαν (γὰρ) πολλοί καὶ ἡκολούθουν αὐτῷ (v.15c). As a result a great paradigm about Jesus' mission to the "sinners" had been created with v.13-17. The logion of v.17b, which was added at the same time as the story of the call of Levi, served as a statement of the principle that guided Jesus and had been exemplified in v.14, viz. to go to those classed as sinners in order to invite them to convert. The fact that Mk did not add any further details to the story suggests that for him what matters is only Jesus' paradigmatic behavior and its verbal ratification. The main interest is what Jesus did and said, and not the conflict itself. The main point is made by the logion of v.17b so that the rest falls into the background as an exemplification and support for it.

---

<sup>111</sup>One could easily consider the possibility that v.1-12 indicate that the logion of v.17b was originally an integral part of the pericope, as Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 84f has argued by taking ἀμαρτωλοί as the key term. However, as he also admits (p.83, also van Iersel, "La vocation" 218f n.16), the plural ἀμαρτωλοί was a sort of terminus technicus for "pagans" and to that extent differs from v.1ff.

<sup>112</sup>See Berak.43b; jShab.3c (Shammai!); and the references given by Billerbeck, II, 510f; IV, 374ff.611ff, as well as the observations of G.F. Moore, Judaism II, 74f, and III, 178f. See already Jub.22,16; 3 Mac.3,4, and Jn.4,9!

b. The ἤλθον-saying. The addition of the ἤλθον-saying, which constitutes the unquestionable climax of the grand paradigm (v.13-17), ties very closely the call of Levi and the meal with the "sinners". That is to say, the ambiguous καλεῖν (which is pregnant with meaning) covers the two meanings exemplified by v.14 and by v.15f, viz. a call to conversion and a consequent invitation to table-fellowship with Jesus. RMk has further stressed this double aspect of καλεῖν by adding v.15c --which stresses the sense of conversion-following/discipleship,-- and v.16b --which stresses the identity of the guests. The addition of v.17b establishes a loose defining parallelism between the δίκαιοι and the ἰσχύοντες.<sup>113</sup> The κακῶς ἔχοντες are no longer the sinners but all those considered in the eyes of Judaism not to be δίκαιοι. There was also a shift of emphasis, from that of Jesus' concern for the sick ones and their salvation, to that of calling to conversion (v.14) and table-fellowship (v.15f).

When the ἤλθον-saying existed independently of its present context it referred to the invitation or call to conversion: καλέσαι ἁμαρτωλοῦς. The δίκαιοι and the ἁμαρτωλοί were thought by Jesus to be truly so.<sup>114</sup> However, when the logion was introduced into its present context, δίκαιοι acquired an ironic tone. Now δίκαιοι referred directly to the objectors who considered their criticism justified. Their condemnation of those who were not like them as ἁμαρτωλοί was considered justified precisely because they thought of themselves as δίκαιοι. Because of this attitude they rejected the invitation to conversion and consequently were excluded from the table-fellowship (cf. Lk.15,7; 18,9-13). It is ironic in as much as the terminology used assimilates the shades of meaning it has in the minds of Jesus' adversaries, only to invert them.<sup>115</sup> Not

<sup>113</sup>I say "a loose parallelism" because καλεῖν ≠ χρεῖαν ἔχειν.

<sup>114</sup>For Jesus not all Jews were hypocrites. He recognized in many an honest will to do God's will (cf. Mt.5,45; 13,49; 25,31ff; Lk.15,7.10.13ff). Originally δίκαιος had a praiseworthy sense, as indeed it almost always has in Lk. It is the story, where the logion was inserted, that gives it an ironical tone and robs δίκαιοι from its original sense. Cf. Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 84f, for a different view.

<sup>115</sup>Many scholars have argued against any suggestion that v.17b may somehow have an ironical tone. However, they have failed to distinguish between the sense of the logion before ///

only is there nothing positive said about Pharisaism in this logion, but there is an implicit condemnation of their lopsided understanding of righteousness. Those taken to be ἁματωλοί are, in Jesus' eyes, true δίκαιοι in as much as they converted, i.e. Jesus reverted the conception of true righteousness. By the fact that Jesus calls ἁματωλοί to convert and has table-fellowship with them, he makes himself at one solidaric with them --a solidarity that will eventually lead him to the cross. By eating with the "sinners" Jesus and his disciples are, in the final analysis, also sinners in the eyes of their objectors.

The dialectic negative indicates that the δίκαιοι are not excluded from the invitation, even though Jesus' concern concentrates on the ἁματωλοί. It is to be noted that there is no article accompanying δικαίους and ἁματωλούς, i.e. there is no specification of a group of people, there is rather a universalistic general application.

c. The Meaning of ἦλθον. What sense does ἦλθον have in this logion? When the logion is considered in itself, isolated from its present context as it originally was, there was no reference or allusion to Jesus' pre-existence.<sup>116</sup> The logion in effect reflects no interest on the question of Jesus' origin, even if ἦλθον prompts one to ask "whence?"<sup>117</sup> The stress is not on ἦλθον but on the infinitive of purpose: it was for this reason that it was added as a climax to this story. The primordial meaning of ἦλθον in this logion can best be ex-

/// and after it was integrated to the pericope; thus Schlatter, Mt 309; Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II, 175; Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 7; Schmid, Mk 65; Jeremias, NTTh I, 147. Correctly understood by Descamps, Justes 105f. Pesch, "Zöllnergastmahl" 80, in spite of distinguishing the stages of composition of our pericope, holds that v.17a and not v.17b was added later, and denies any irony in the latter.

<sup>116</sup>Jülicher, op.cit., 175; Lagrange, Mk 45; Lohmeyer, Mk 56, and Cranfield, Mk 106, hold that the pre-existence of Jesus is alluded to here. But again, this may be concluded when the logion is considered in its present context, but hardly so before it was introduced there; see our observations below.

<sup>117</sup>The answer could be as much "from Nazareth" as "from God" --one could argue for any, but that would be missing the point since that was not in the intention of the logion, and neither the logion nor the context give the slightest hint in that sense.



pressed as "my purpose is to ....," "my Lebensberuf is to ....," for which ἦλθον + inf. may well be a circumloquium.<sup>118</sup>

When the logion was inserted in its present context, ἦλθον acquired a nuance it hardly had before, viz. that of a God-given mission. In the light of the re-interpretation that the context provided to our logion, and the new nuances it added to it, ἦλθον approaches the sense and implications of ἀπεστάλην coming to mean "my God-given mission is to ...."<sup>119</sup> In fact, the verb ἐρχεσθαι acquired an importance it did not have before, as Lk's change to the pft. ἐλήλυθα indicates.

Since the mission of Jesus is said to be to καλεῖσαι ἁμαρτωλούς which, as we already indicated, in its present context meant a call to that table-fellowship which is an anticipation of the heavenly banquet --as is so often painted in the parables,-- it follows that the one issuing this invitation must come from the "heavenly mansion" to which he is inviting all men of good will. In other words, the early Church was well aware that Jesus had indeed come from God and had invited us to become partakers of the Kingdom of God. Thus, once joined to the pericope, our logion's ἦλθον alludes to Jesus' divine origin without referring to it.<sup>120</sup>

Even though according to the story the reproach was not addressed to Jesus himself, it is he who responds. It is thus underlined that although Jesus is only a guest in the house, he assumes the functions of the Pater familias (as is his role in the Father's house!),<sup>121</sup> i.e. a position of authority. The

<sup>118</sup>Cf. Zahn, Mt 337; Jeremias, "Schicht" 166f, as well as Best, Temptation 139.

<sup>119</sup>Lamarche, "L'appel" 135f, considers it to be very close to the Johannine texts, such as 8,42 and 12,47, indicative of a contact between them. This seems to me unjustified for he places too much unwarranted weight on the verb ἐρχεσθαι which for him is the most important element here.

<sup>120</sup>The Letter of Barnabas, Ep.Cat.v,9, contains the following reflection: "As He chose his own apostles, who should preach the Gospel, who were sinners, with it he showed that he is not come, the righteous to call, but sinners, thus He revealed that He is God's son."

<sup>121</sup>In the final analysis, a narrow bridge was laid between the earthly and the eschatological meal. The mission of Jesus led him to trespass the legalisms created by Jewish piety but which ran astray of God's loving will. Thus he came to call those rejected by the halakah. He not only invited them to conversion but thereupon sat at the same table and ///

logion already by itself reveals a sense of authority and mission-consciousness.

Do we find in this logion a manifestation of Jesus' "messianic consciousness"? Not necessarily (cf. c.VII). The invitation to sinners to repent and convert (sense of v.17b before being integrated into the pericope) was frequently addressed by the prophets to the Chosen People, and lately by John the Baptist (Mt.3,1f par.; in Jesus' mouth in Mt.4,17). Thus, it is easier to think that, behind this logion stood Jesus' prophetic --not messianic-- consciousness and his awareness of a mission willed by God for him to carry out. This, evidently, if one assumes that the logion of v.17b goes back to Jesus.

## 2. The ἡλθεν-saying and the Matthean Redaction.

The Mtan text offers two significant differences from the Mkan one: the addition of ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν in v.11b, and the citation of Hos.6,6 in v.13a. Both differences are related to each other: Mt presents Jesus' reply as a teaching, thus explaining the title ὁ διδάσκαλος and the introduction of the citation from Hosea with a "school formula" typical of Rabbinic debates (πορευθέντες μάθετε = תלמידיך לך).<sup>122</sup> We therefore have a catechetical perspective occasioned by debates with Pharisaism.

a. The Citation of Hos.6,6a. It is the citation of Hos.6,6a which commands our attention. We find the same citation again only in Mt.12,7,<sup>123</sup> and in both occasions Mt ties Hos.6,6 with a logion that follows by means of γάρ. He thus establishes a Scriptural support for the latter.<sup>124</sup> It is evident that Mt

---

/// ate the same meal with them, i.e. entertained a Lebensgemeinschaft, a true berit (which originally signified a communion effected by a table fellowship --cf. Qumran). This was also taught in the parables, using the image of a banquet. On the rich meaning that a meal has in the Near East see esp. E. Pax, "Essen und Trinken," BibL 10(1969), 275-291.

<sup>122</sup>Cf. Sifre Nm.115, R.Lev.1,15; further Billerbeck I,499. Also in Mt.24,32 and 28,19.

<sup>123</sup>Only Mt cites it, an indication that it must have been important to his community. Mk.12,33c alludes to it.

<sup>124</sup>It is not impossible that the citation of Hos.6,6 was already in Mt's special source (M), and that v.13b was ///

intended to create a link between the citation from Hos. and the ἡλθον-saying. This is evidenced by the causal γάρ, mercy (ἔλεος) being καλέσαι ἁμαρτολούς, which is what Jesus did, and θυσία referring to the concerns with the prescriptions of cultic purity which forbade Jews to have dealings with "sinners".

The citation of Hos.6,6a is a verbatim quotation either from the MT or from the LXX.<sup>125</sup> In Hosea there is no intention of banning sacrificial cult; rather he calls attention to the primacy of mercy (ἔλεος / ὁπ), relativizing the external cult.<sup>126</sup> It is not impossible that Jesus might have quoted Hos.6,6 at some time, but it remains questionable whether it could have been in this context;<sup>127</sup> it is easier to explain as a Mtan addition --a more probable place would be 12,7.<sup>128</sup>

b. The Formative Milieu. The two closely related differences from the Mkan text, mentioned above, reveal a "setting in life" that differs from that of Mk (and Lk). For Mt it is not so much an inner-communitarian problem but, in the light of the reference to Jesus as διδάσκαλος and the citation of Hos.6,6a,

---

/// added to it by Mt from pre-Mk. In fact, if Mt had all 3 sayings in the same source, the order 12.13b.13a would impose itself as most logical; if he only had the two sayings of pre-Mk and Hos.6,6 was added, then we would also have had that order; but, if he had only v.12.13a the present order of logia is understandable when passing from one source to the other. In this respect it should be noted that the conjunction γάρ, in v.13b, is awkward and puzzling as a link; καί would have been smoother.

<sup>125</sup>Stendahl, after studying the different versions, concluded that "It may be directly dependent upon the M.T., but also upon a Greek rendering." (School 128). While Strecker thinks more in terms of the LXX (Weg 135), Gundry, Use of the OT 111, 149, and Sand, Gesetz 58 n.12, think that it probably was taken from the Hebrew. The B and Lucianic versions have ἡ while Aquila reads καὶ οὐ as conjunction, where the MT reads וְיִי --the Tg (Jonathan) has instead וְיִי ("rather than").

<sup>126</sup>Hosea strongly opposed idolatry (cf. 4,12-17; 10,5; 11,2; etc.) but also considered the cessation of sacrifices to Yahweh as a punishment (3,4; 9,4). On the whole see the study of C. Lattey, "The Prophets and Sacrifice: A Study in Biblical Relativity," JTS 42(1941), 155-165, esp. 160.

<sup>127</sup>Stendahl, op.cit. 128, observed: "Concise as it is, one could take it to be a word of Jesus where the exact wording in the O.T. source did not play any part." Similar is the opinion of Schlatter, Mt 308, Plummer, Mt 104, Allen, Mt 90, and McNeile, Mt 119.

<sup>128</sup>Thus also Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 44.

it is a polemic against Judaism around the question of external cultic purity, serving a catechetical purpose for his community.<sup>129</sup> It is not a discussion about the value of sacrificial cult, as is clearly the case in 12,1ff.<sup>130</sup> In the background may be a concern with the relations between Judeo and Gentile Christians within the Mtan community. However, Mt is less concerned with table-fellowship than with the question of acceptance and integration of the Gentile Christians in a community constituted predominantly by Judeo-Christians.<sup>131</sup> One must not exclude the possibility that a missionary concern may also be playing a role: Judeo-Christians wondering whether they should enter into contact with pagans.<sup>132</sup> The period with which we are dealing is shortly after the destruction of the Temple.<sup>133</sup>

For Mt the citation of Hos.6,6 provides a Scriptural legitimation for Jesus' behavior. It is also a key of interpretation for the ἡλιθίων-saying which becomes its actualizing messianic counterpart.<sup>134</sup> In fact, Hos.6,6 serves as a critical principle for the understanding of the Law: the precept of love should be the guiding principle for the understanding of the Torah as God intended it. The Jews do not know God's ultimate

---

<sup>129</sup>This might explain the omission of αὐτοῖς in v.12a; cf. van Iersel, "La vocation" 227f. However, in my opinion the debate with Judaism cannot be considered as having been totally absent, as van Iersel seems to suppose when he places all the weight on the didactic intention of Mt. One of the most salient traits of the Mtan gospel is precisely its polemic with Judaism. The Rabbinic-type formula (which van Iersel ignores) πορεύθεντες μαθεῖτε points in that direction, as does the reference to the OT. See the study of Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*.

<sup>130</sup>Cf. Hummel, *op.cit.* 97-103. As Taylor, *Sacrifice* 68, observes, if it were against sacrificial cult a better text could have been chosen.

<sup>131</sup>For Sand, *Gesetz* 59, it is rather a community problem between pious legalists and non-legalists, a situation similar to the one Jesus himself found. But see Hummel, *op.cit.* 39, whom Sand opposes.

<sup>132</sup>Cf. Lamarche, "L'appel" 135.

<sup>133</sup>Schweizer, *Mt* 146; Hummel, *op.cit.* 98. Abot Natan 8, 22, shortly after 70 A.D., cited Hos.6,6 twice, reflecting on the new situation that developed without a Temple.

<sup>134</sup>The particle γὰρ in v.13b indicates that for Mt Hos.6,6 justifies Jesus' purpose to make God's innermost will manifest. It is not Jesus' action that justifies Hos.6,6 but the latter that legitimizes Jesus' action and word. Jesus places God's authentic will over against the Pharisees' "constructed" will of God. A similar understanding underlies 5,17 (q.v.).

will,<sup>135</sup> which is precisely what Jesus was accomplishing. Well in line with Mt's presentation of Jesus as the one who accomplishes the Scriptures, Hos.6,6 is introduced primarily for its Christological, and not ethical, reference: Jesus' behavior is exemplary of God's will and is in full accordance with Scripture. The Pharisees' objection is confronted not first with Jesus but with Scripture, which has the effect of softening the opposition between Jesus/Church and Pharisees/Judaism. Finally, the importance that Mt attaches to love/mercy is also put into evidence here: the greater context of the Mtan pericope is within a series of cures (8,1-9,35) and not, as in Mk (2,1-3,6) and Lk (5,17-6,11), within a series of controversies.

c. The ἦλθον-saying. While in Mk it is the ἦλθον-saying that constitutes the climax of the story, in Mt it is the citation of Hosea that is the key to it. While in Mk the weight of the ἦλθον-saying is on the "what" of Jesus' mission, in Mt the "who" teaches thus has as much weight as "what" he teaches. Jesus' authority and messiahship comes stronger to the fore in Mt than in Mk: he is the διδάσκαλος (v.11b) who refers the Scriptures (v.13a) to himself (v.13b). It is interesting to observe that both sayings in v.13 are expressed in the first person, as if Jesus were appropriating to himself a declaration that originally was Yahweh's (through the prophet's mouth): does Mt suggest an identity between them? is that the real function of the conjunction γάρ?<sup>136</sup> Keeping in mind its present context in Mt, ἦλθον in v.13b acquires an importance of its own, viz. that of a divine epiphany: Jesus is the bringer of salvation for all men. It has the sense of an authoritatively definite "I have come to ...." The Church's consciousness of Jesus' messianity is projected onto his lips from where it bounces back to the hearer of this story.

---

<sup>135</sup> This is well underlined by μάθετε ! an invitation to scrutinize and make real (verwirklichen) the true sense of Scripture, aided by the example of Jesus' action; cf. 9,29.

<sup>136</sup> Evidently this fact --which may well be unintentional-- should not be pressed too far; the citation of Hos.6,6 appears also in the first person in the OT, and the ἦλθον-saying is taken over from pre-Mk.

### 3. The ἦλθον-saying Within the Lukan Redaction.

The Lukan text presents a number of differences with that of pre-Mk; these were noted above. Two differences interest us here, both occurring in the ἦλθον-logion: the tense of the verb ἔρχεσθαι and the addition εἰς μετάνοιαν. These already indicate that Lk's outlook is markedly ecclesiological.

a. The Call to Conversion. The addition εἰς μετάνοιαν,<sup>137</sup> while specifying the meaning in which καλεῖσθαι had been intended, restricts it to conversion. Lk gives primary importance to conversion as a condition sine qua non for any intimate relation with Jesus. This addition establishes a closer tie between the call of Levi and the ἦλθον-saying than between the meal and the logion --a sort of inclusio. A similar schema is found in 19,1-10 (q.v.). Table-fellowship with Jesus is only possible once conversion has taken place: those who have been cured, who no longer are sick, can share in such a meal. This is exemplified in this case with Levi's call and meal. It is to be observed that Levi is named on both occasions.<sup>138</sup> The κακῶς ἔχοντες and ἁμαρτωλοί are those in need of conversion.<sup>139</sup>

The addition of εἰς μετάνοιαν responds to an ecclesiological concern. To call to conversion is a mission that extended from John the Baptist to the mission entrusted to Jesus' disciples in 24,47 (κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη).<sup>140</sup> That Lk takes the point

<sup>137</sup>This addition is also found in Justin, *Apol.*i,15.8 and Ps.-Justin, *de Resur.*7, while in *Barn.*v,9 it varies according to the MSS and is absent in 2 *Clem.*ii,4.

<sup>138</sup>Lk establishes a continuity between the call to conversion and the invitation to the meal by the concrete example of Levi's call and meal, where it is noteworthy that only Lk mentions that Levi was a τελωνῆς, which carries over to the specific (and only) mention of the τελῶναι as a class in v.29b.

<sup>139</sup>The logion of the physician gains in transparency with the addition of εἰς μετάνοιαν: the κακῶς ἔχοντες are the unconverted ones to whom he goes. To offer them "health" he has to take the initiative; the initiative is one of the aspects that the logion of the physician and the verb καλεῖσθαι implies. Here we may quote the apostle Paul: "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Rom.10,14; see also 1 Cor.9,18).

<sup>140</sup>There is a continuity between the Baptist's call to conversion in view of the coming of the Messiah (Lk.1,15; 3,2), Jesus' call to conversion in view of the Kingdom of God (5,32; 15,7), and the Church's same call to men in the name of ///

of view of this commission and projects it into the pericope, is suggested by the change of the verbal tense of ἐρχεσθαι from the aor. to the perf., and the addressee of the objection to the 2d person plural (v.30b). His concern is the expansion and growth of the Church.<sup>141</sup>

There is no doubt that the aspect of the "meal" is also important for Lk who, more often than the other evangelists, touches upon this topic.<sup>142</sup> This is indicated well in v.29a: ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην, v.30b: ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε (cf.22,30).<sup>143</sup> Table-fellowship with Jesus is the logical climax of conversion; it is entrance into "the eschatological superlative." It is not at all impossible that Lk might be thinking in terms of the Eucharistic celebration.

b. The Formative Conditions. The changes that Lk has operated suggest a community setting in life in which Judeo-Christians, either were wondering whether they should work at the conversion of non-Jews or were criticizing (ἐγόγγυζον) such an endeavor. Thus Lk changed ἁμαρτωλῶν to ἄλλων, suggesting that converted Gentiles are not "sinners"; this contrasts with the reservations of the Pharisees and Scribes (characterization of legalist Judeo-Christians?), where ἁμαρτωλῶν is preserved. He further adds εἰς μετάνοιαν suggesting that, in the light of the command of 24,47, all Christians have the obligation to continue Jesus' mission to preach the Good News and now to expand it to the whole (Hellenistic!) world.<sup>144</sup>

/// Jesus, to convert (24,47; Acts 5,31; 11,18; 20,21; 26,20). It is noteworthy that the theme of conversion recurs more often in Lk than in any of the other gospels; cf. n54 *supra*, as well as Conzelmann, Theology of Luke 99ff, U. Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte, Neukirchen 1961, 178-186, and J. Behm, art. μετάνοιᾶ - μετάνοια, in TDNT IV, esp. 1000-1003.

<sup>141</sup> Schürmann, Lk 290, thinks that a confrontation with Pharisaism on legalistic questions is in the background.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. 7,36-50; 10,38-42; 12,37; 13,26; 14,1-14; 17,7f; 19,5-10; 22,14-38; 24,30-35.41-43.

<sup>143</sup> See Flender, Luke Theologian 80-84.

<sup>144</sup> As Lamarche, "L'appel" 134f, has pointed out, in Lk εἰς καὶ οὖν has a positive sense, designating the truly just ones (cf. 1,6.17; 2,25; 12,57; 14,14; 15,7; 23,47 and 23,50 --in 18,9 and 20,20 it is said that the Pharisees took themselves to be just, but not that they are just). In fact, the addition of εἰς μετάνοιαν takes away any irony. In this connection we read in the Prayer of Manasses, 8: "O Lord, the God of the just, you surely did not appoint repentance (μετάνοιαν) to the just ones ///"

c. The Verb ἔρχεσθαι. The perfect ἐλήλυθα unquestionably represents a post-Paschal point of view: I have come and my work continues with the Church (nuance expressed by the pft.: a past event whose effect continues into the present). It represents a comprehensive view of the totality of Jesus' life among men and a retrospective look into his earthly career. The pft. ἐλήλυθα placed on Jesus' lips reflects on his pre-existence;<sup>145</sup> it has the same connotation here as it has in Jn where it is quite frequent.<sup>146</sup>

Conclusion: The ἦλθον-saying.

It has been shown that the ἦλθον-logion, which in its essence probably goes back to Jesus himself, originally existed separately from the pericope where it is now found. In the face of open criticism for his dealings with those whom Judaism classed as sinners, such a logion was a public statement of the mission Jesus had taken upon himself. It did not express a messianic consciousness nor did it allude to his pre-existence. The verb ἔρχεσθαι had no particular significance in itself until it was included in the present context by pre-Mk, where this logion strengthened the paradigmatic value of the pericope.

Originally ἦλθον + inf. meant "my purpose is to ...."

/// (δικαίοις), to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob who did not sin against you, but you appointed repentance to me the sinner (ἁματωλῶ).<sup>1</sup> See also Justin, Apol.i, 15.

<sup>145</sup>Schürmann, Lk 292.

<sup>146</sup>Cf. Jn.5,43a; 7,28b; 8,42b; 12,46; 16,28; 18,37b (all of which will be briefly discussed in c. VI); see also 3,2b.19b. A relationship between the gospels of Jn and Lk has been recognized for some time and here we have one more indication of it. In general see the studies of J. Schniewind, Die Parallelerikopen bei Lukas und Johannes, Leipzig 1914, P. Gardner-Smith, Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge 1938, and more recently J.A. Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John (NovT Sup VII), Leiden 1963, and the overview given by J. Blinzler, Johannes und die Synoptiker (SBS 5), Stuttgart 1965, as well as Grundmann, Lk 17-22. The relation (or influence) seems to be from Lk to Jn, as Blinzler, op.cit. passim, and most recently Boismard, Synopse 40 and passim (and his forthcoming vol.III of the Synopse), indicate. R.E. Brown, The Gospel according to John, I (AB 29), New York 1966, XLIV-XLVII, discusses many of the opinions expressed on this subject, but is more selective than Blinzler's presentation. R. Schnackenburg, Das Johannesevangelium, I (HThKNT IV), 2d ed. Freiburg 1967, 30f, denies any influence.



Once enclosed in its present context ἡλθον acquired an importance of its own: like the physician coming to the sick to bring them health, so Christ's soteriological initiative directs itself (ἡλθον) primarily --not exclusively: dialectic formulation-- to the sinners. Now ἡλθον came to mean "my God-given mission is to ...," approaching ἀπεστάλην and alludes to Jesus' divine origin, the source of his authority. In the context of Mk the logion's weight is on the object of Jesus' mission. Lk presents a more ecclesiological outlook, while in Mt the stress is on the person, authority, and messiahship of Jesus.

- - - - -

## II. COME TO CAST FIRE - COME TO CAST THE SWORD: Lk.12,49-50. 51-53/Mt.10,34-36.<sup>1</sup>

Mt.10, built in chiastic form,<sup>2</sup> constitutes a block<sup>3</sup> and has been arranged into a discernable thematic structure<sup>4</sup> --a sign of an intentional composition. Verses 32-39 are a collection of different logia concerning the radicality of discipleship: they intend to call to a definite decision for Christ.

<sup>1</sup>Besides the standard commentaries, see the following studies: (1) concerning Lk.12,49f: G. Dellling, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΒΑΠΤΙΣ-ΘΗΝΑΙ," NovT 2(1957/58), 92-115; A. Feuillet, "La Coupe et le Baptême de la Passion," RB 64(1967), 356-391; G. Graystone, "I have come to cast fire on the earth ...," Scr 4(1949-51), 135-141; O. Kuss, "Zur Frage einer vorpaulinischen Todestaufe," MTZ 4(1953), 1-17; F.H. Seper, "Καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἡδη ἀνήφθη (Lc 12, 49b)," VD 36(1958), 147-153, and R.A. Ward, "St. Luke xii.49: καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἡδη ἀνήφθη," ExpT 63(1951/52), 92f. (2) Concerning Lk.12,51 par. see O. Betz, "Jesu Heiliger Krieg," NovT 2(1957/58), 116-137; M. Black, "Uncomfortable Words: III. The Violent Word," ExpT 81(1969/70), 115-118; A. George, "La venue de Jésus, cause de division entre les hommes," in Assamblées du Seigneur 51 (1972), 62-71, and S. Légasse, "Approche de l'Épisode préévangélique des Fils de Zébédée," NTS 20(1973/74), 161-177.

<sup>2</sup>Introduction: v.1-4; A: v.5-15 (mission of the Twelve); B: v.16-31 (consequences and implications of discipleship); B': v.32-39 (as B); A': v.40-42 (reception of disciples).

<sup>3</sup>Mt.10,1, καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, introduces a series of instructions, warnings, and exhortations to the Twelve. Mt.11,1 closes this discourse section with the classical Mtan expression καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς (cf. 7,28; 13,53; 19,1; 26,1).

<sup>4</sup>This is especially noteworthy in the central section: ///

Verses 34-36 are preceded and followed by logia that sharply call, in a markedly categorical language, to a radical and unconditional open option for Christ. It can therefore be supposed that the present position of v.34-36 is due to (pre-?) Mt.

Lk.12,49-53 is found within a less (than Mt's) artistic composition, where material proper to Lk (L) with material having a parallel only in Mt (Q) is interspersed. However, these verses are framed by two parables (v.35-48.54-56) about the necessity to be attentive to the *κατερός*.

#### A. Literary Criticism.

##### 1. The Logia of Lk.12,49.50

Lk.12,49f, without a parallel, has the distinctive air of being composed of two previously independent logia which have been placed together because of a similarity in content.<sup>5</sup> Their origin and relation will hopefully become clear with a literary analysis of them. The reason for their absence in Mt could be explained, as much by their having originated in a source known only to Lk, as by an intentional omission from the part of Mt (and Mk?). This hopefully will also find an explanation in the following paragraphs.

Verse 49 betrays neither a vocabulary nor a grammatical structure that could be termed "typically Lukan."<sup>6</sup> The expres-

/// B: instructions,

- a v.16-20: persecutions and confessing Christ;
- b 21-22: family divisions;
- a' 23 : when persecuted flee;
- c 24-25: the master is above the disciple;
- a'' 26-31: not to fear those who can kill only the body.

B': exhortations,

- a v.32-33: confessing Christ before men;
- b 34-36: family divisions;
- a' 37 : loving Christ above one's family;
- c 38 : on taking one's cross;
- a'' 39 : on not seeking to save one's "soul".

<sup>5</sup>Grundmann, Lk 269, recognizes 3 logia: Lk.12,49.50.51-53, as George, "La venue" 71, does, and indicates that their formal rhythmic construction may indicate that they were found together, all belonging to Q. For George, *art.cit.* 71, it was Lk who gathered them (hence two sources?). According to Légasse, "Ap-proche" 164f, Lk has two elements: v.49.50.51 "dont l'association est ancienne," even though they were independent logia, and v.52f of apocalyptic outlook similar to Mk.13,12f. Légasse's opinion is very close to my own.

<sup>6</sup>Thus also George, *art.cit.* 69. The expression ///

sion  $\pi\omega\epsilon\ \beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  may be a literal translation of a Semitic one (Hebr.  $\text{שָׂרַח אֵשׁ}$ /Aram.  $\text{ܫܪܚܐ ܢܘܪܐ}$ ), with the nuance "to start/kindle a fire." Likewise, v.49b is very Semitic:  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  is a Semitic-like rhetorical question (=  $\text{ܡܐ}$ ) which "performs the function of exclamation as well as interrogative,"<sup>7</sup> and  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  serves the function of the Hebr.  $\text{אֵל}$  or  $\text{אִם}$  and Aram.  $\text{ܐܝܢܐ(ܐ)}/\text{ܐܝܢܐ}$  to express a wish.<sup>8</sup> The whole v.49b may be expressed in Aram. as  $\text{ܘܡܗ ܥܒܕܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܠܝܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܕܠܐܩܪܝܬ}$ .<sup>9</sup> Thus, v.49 is not due to Lk but is very ancient and comes either from L or from Q (cf. *infra*).<sup>10</sup>

The saying in v.50, built in a form similar to v.49, is most probably due to the Lkan (final?) redactor. The first half echoes Mk.10,38d; the whole pericope Mk.10,35-40/Mt.20,20-23 was omitted in Lk. Even though the vocabulary of v.50a is not Lkan, the following observations connote a Lkan construction: (1) the Mkan parallel suggests that v.49 and v.50 were originally unrelated,<sup>11</sup> (2) the noun  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  and the verb

/// does not recur in the NT, and it is absent in the LXX where  $\beta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  is most often used instead (as also in Lk.17,29!). We do find  $\pi\omega\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$ , in Lk.9,54, as well as the frequent "to be cast into the eternal fire." The verb  $\alpha\acute{\nu}\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  occurs again only in Jam.3,5, and the formula  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \eta\delta\eta$  only in Mk.15,44 where it also has a temporal sense.

<sup>7</sup>Black, *Aramaic* 123; cf. also Bl-D §299(4) and Moulton, *NTGk* II, 472. Its function is similar to the more Gk  $\kappa\omega\iota$  of v.50.

<sup>8</sup>Again in 19,42, having an optative sense; cf. also Isa. 9,5; Num.14,2b; Jos.7,7b; Sir.23,14. See further Bl-D §360(4) and Seper, "Καὶ τὸ θέλω" 150f.

<sup>9</sup>Retroversion according to sense, not word by word, by C. C. Torrey, in "The Translations made from the original Aramaic Gospels," in *Studies in the History of Religions* (FS C.H. Toy), New York 1912, 315, and after him by Moulton, *NTGk* II, 472, and Black, *Aramaic* 123, cf. also p.274ff. Thus, it is not a question but, with optative sense means "And how I wish that it were already kindled!" (Torrey, *art.cit.* and Moulton, *ibid.*). Zerwick, *Greek* §405, contests this understanding on the grounds that it is "a desire incapable of fulfillment" that is expressed in v.50b; however, this opinion seems to spring from a preconception about the message of this verse, and furthermore, he offers no alternative solution. Not few see it as (a sort of deliberative subjunctive) question, eg. Ward, "St. Luke xii.49" 92, Roberts, "Some Comments" 306, Plummer, *Lk* 334, Burney, *Poetry* 90, and Feuillet, "La Coupe" 368 n.40, 369.

The Hebr. form would run:  $\text{וְהִנֵּה לִי כֹהֵן וְהִנֵּה לִי כֹהֵן}$ ; see the detailed discussion of this retroversion by Seper, *art.cit.* 147-153.

<sup>10</sup>According to Schulz, *Q* 258, v.49 may be due to Lk, inspired by v.51 --see the discussion of this relation below.

<sup>11</sup>Bultmann, *ST* 153f, suspects v.50 to be "a secondary development" of v.49. An original separate existence is recognized by most exegetes but contested by Kümmel, *Promise* 70. The particle  $\delta\epsilon$  is also frequently used by Lk to establish a link (cf. *infra*); it is omitted by the Diates. Arab., L, it<sup>c</sup>, q, syr<sup>s</sup>.

βαπτισθῆναι ("to be baptized with a baptism") occur together only again in Lk.7,29 and Acts 19,4, aside from Mk.10,38.39. (3) The Semitizing use of a verb and its cognate noun is also to be found in Lk.2,9; 11,46; 22,15; 23,46; Acts 5,28; 23,14.<sup>12</sup> (4) The connection between fire and baptism is to be found again only in Lk.3,16 and Acts 1,15; 11,16, and (5) less significant, but nonetheless indicative, is the use of ἔχειν + inf. (1/1/5+6). The second half of v.50 presents indications of a Lkan vocabulary: συνέχειν (1/0/6+3) and the expression ἕως ὅρου (1/0/3) are very possibly Lkan. It is also to be observed that Lk uses τελέω (in the passive) in the sense of fulfilment/accomplishment also in 18,31 and 22,37, but this never occurs in Mt and Mk when referring to the Passion. The suggestion which presents itself is that this term, with the same meaning in 12,50, could be due to Lk. The similarity in construction with v.49 may also be indicative --especially if they did not originally exist together.<sup>13</sup> One may be tempted to conclude that it is highly probable that v.50 may be an arranged addition made by Lk,<sup>14</sup> and therefore was unknown to Mt, if it were not for the fact that in 20,22f/Mk.10,38f Mt leaves out the reference to baptism. Therefore the possibility is not to be excluded that Mt knew this saying but for some reason omitted it.<sup>15</sup> However, the former seems to me more probable.

We may therefore conclude that v.49 and v.50 had different origins and that they were not always together. The logion of v.49 had been preserved from a very ancient tradition; the saying of v.50 had most probably a Lkan tradition. It should also be observed that while v.49 has for its object the

<sup>12</sup>For Dellling, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ" 242, it is very probably of Palestinian origin. This literary play on words is by no means exclusive to Lk, even if it is more frequent there; see eg. Mk.4,41; Mt.22,11. See further Bl-D §198(6), Moulton, NTGk II, 443f, and Moule, Idiom-Book 177f.

<sup>13</sup>According to Légasse, "Approche" 165, the original of v.50 may have been par. in form to v.49 and would have read ἡλθον βαπτισμα βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη τελέσθῃ. However, it is difficult to see why Lk would have wanted to destroy such a parallelism and changed only v.50 to its present form.

<sup>14</sup>Thus also Boismard, Synopse 285. For George, "La venue" 69f, only v.50b is due to Lk; v.50a could go back to Jesus.

<sup>15</sup>Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 122f, Manson, Sayings 119 ///

world at large, v.50 is concerned exclusively with Jesus' personal fate.

## 2. The Logion of Lk.12,51-53/Mt.10,34-36.

Mt.10,34-36 apparently constitutes a well built unity: v.34 enigmatically states an aspect of Jesus' mission, v.35 explains it by alluding to Mic.7,6, and v.36 summarizes the latter. The parallel, Lk.12,51-53, also gives the impression of constituting a unity: v.51 states an aspect of Jesus' mission, v.52 explains the latter and introduces v.53 which develops v.52. Whether the allusion to Micah was associated with v.34 from its beginning, as it is generally assumed, is open to question. The reference to Micah could have been introduced with a catechetical purpose: with Jesus' coming began the eschatological times, for he is the Messiah.<sup>16</sup> It explicates and amplifies the obscure saying of v.34 by drawing from the OT to make a present situation of adversities acceptable. While Mt.10,34 is a universal statement, v.35f turns to the particular.

a. The ἤλθον-saying. The form of Mt.10,34 is exactly the same as that of Mt.5,17: μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἤλθον + inf. + direct object ( ) οὐκ ἤλθον + the same inf. ( ) ἀλλὰ ( ). This identity, which recurs nowhere else, points to the final Mtan redactor himself. The Lkan parallel (12,51) presents in turn an identity in form with Lk.13,2f.4f: δοκεῖτε ὅτι ...; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν ἀλλ' ..., which likewise points to the final Lkan redactor. Before we turn our attention to the individual components of this logion, I would like to point out that what follows is extremely hypothetical. The relation between the texts in Mt and in Lk is difficult to determine, given the fact that both have been greatly retouched, and it is difficult to determine the possible role played by Lk.12,49 in their formation. That Lk.12,49 may have been known to Mt is not to be excluded a priori, on account of the similarity in form (not content) between Lk.12,49a and Mt.10,34a.

/// Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas 277, Grundmann, Lk 269, and Schürmann, Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen 234, think that probably Mt omitted Lk.12,49.50 which had been together with v.51-53 in Q. <sup>16</sup>Cf. Schulz, Q 260, and our discussion below, p.74ff.

The expression  $\mu\eta\ \nuομίσητε\ \acute{\omicron}\tauι$  is most probably due to Rmt,<sup>17</sup> and  $\deltaοκείτε\ \acute{\omicron}\tauι$  to RLk. Which of the two, if any, is more primitive is difficult to ascertain, and must remain an open question even though it seems to me by far more probable that Lk intentionally changed the Mtan formulation, than the inverse.<sup>18</sup>

The expression  $\eta\lambdaθον\ βαλεῖν\ (\ )\ \acute{\epsilon}\piι\ τὴν\ γῆν$  in Mt.10,34a is identical to that in Lk.12,49a, while it is found in a much altered form (by RLk) in Lk.12,51a. This raises the possibility that this formulation (and therefore 12,49!) could have been known to Mt through Q.<sup>19</sup> This also suggests that the

<sup>17</sup>Syr<sup>c</sup> has instead of  $\mu\eta\ \nuομίσητε\ \acute{\omicron}\tauι$  only the succinct  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa!$

<sup>18</sup>We find  $\nuομίζειν$  3/0/2+7, and  $\deltaοκεῖν$  10/2/10+9 times used. However, it is to be noted that Mt has  $\deltaοκεῖν$  a number of times when formulating a rhetorical question (18,21; 21,28; 22,17.42; 26,53.66) and that in 3,9 we find the expression  $\mu\eta\ \deltaόξετε$ , where the Lkan par. does not have it. This means that it is conceivable that Mt could have written the same in 10,34 if his source had suggested it. However, this does not necessarily mean that  $\nuομίζειν$  was in Mt's source, even though it suggests that  $\deltaοκεῖν$  was due to RLk and that Rmt did not have it in front of his eyes. On the other hand, Lk uses  $\deltaοκεῖν$  on his own account several times (where there is no parallel): 1,3; 10,36; 13,2.4; 19,11; 24,37; 22,24, where Mt/Mk do not have this verb. For Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas 276 n.2, Lagrange, Lk 51, and Hawkins, HS 168, the observation that Lk tends to omit questions and the fact that here we have a question is an indication that the Lkan formulation is older. However, see Lk.13,2f.4f, which are certainly a Lkan formulation! Grundmann, Mt 299, and Strecker, Weg 144, consider  $\mu\eta\ \nuομίσητε$  to be definitely due to Rmt's hand. According to Schulz, Q 258,  $\deltaοκεῖτε$  was already in Q! See further the interesting observations made by Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 227. Given the fact that Lk presents a number of changes made to the version found in Mt, as we shall see, it is possible to think that Lk changed  $\mu\eta\ \nuομίσητε$  to  $\deltaοκεῖτε$ .

<sup>19</sup>If Mt knew Lk.12,49 it was either from Q or pre-Lk, but not from RLk since the latter changed the Mtan text. For Grundmann, Lk 269, Lk's v.49f originated either in L or more probably in Q, and has been left out by Mt. For Schürmann, Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen 234, Lk.12,49f came from the "Redequelle", while in p.213 n.24 he admits that Mt.10,34 may be a "matthäische Reminiszenz an Lk 12,49", only to reject this view in p.234. Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 122f, and Rengstorff, Lk 166, consider them as coming from a special source (S), and Taylor, Sacrifice 165, considers the block Lk.12,49-53 as belonging to L. Manson, Teaching 226 n.1, and Schmid, Lk 225, postulate different sources for v.49f and for v.51-53: for the former v.49f come from L and v.51-53 from Q, while for the latter v.49f come from an isolated tradition to which Lk appended v.51-53. Hoffmann, Logienquelle 41, concludes that it is difficult to ascertain whether or not v.49f was in Q. Others suppose different sources for Mt and Lk, thus Allen, Mt 110, Plummer, Mt 156 n.2, Lagrange, Mt 211, Robinson, Mt 96, and Albright-Mann, Mt 130. All this shows the literary difficulties inherent in these sayings!

original saying read οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην (ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν?) ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν,<sup>20</sup> which later was conflated. If this is so, it becomes possible to think that Lk.12,49 and 12,51 (in its most primitive form, as given above) were together, tied by the hook-expression(s) ἦλθον βαλεῖν and ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (?);<sup>21</sup> v.49 was omitted by Mt. That becomes more plausible inasmuch as v.50 was a Lkan insertion. It should also be observed that the shorter form, οὐκ ... ἀλλά, was also the primitive one in Mt. 5,17 (q.v.), and is that found in Mk.2,17b; 10,45a par.; Lk. 9,56a; it is also witnessed to by Irenaeus I,3.5 (without ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν!). It is impossible to determine whether the complement ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν was originally in the logion of v.34b. If this logion had been placed together with that of Lk.12,49 at an early stage, then it is probable that, having been a term that attracted this union, it was part of the logion and was later moved up to v.34a, as was the case in Mt.5,17 with τὸν νόμον. However, it could have been added later, in the Mtan tradition, under the influence of the logion of Lk.12,49. It should be noted that all other οὐκ ἦλθον ... ἀλλά logia, in their primitive form, did not have a complement and that there was a tendency to amplify and complete them.<sup>22</sup>

The curious expression βαλεῖν εἰρήνην is explicable as being a Semitism,<sup>23</sup> for which we have several examples: Lev.R. 9(111b): וַיִּשָּׁלַח בָּרָכָה, Pea 1,1b: וַיִּשָּׁלַח בָּרָכָה,<sup>24</sup> Mek. to Ex.20,25: ... וַיִּשָּׁלַח בָּרָכָה (= T.Baba k 7,7) and Sifre Num.16: וַיִּשָּׁלַח בָּרָכָה ... וַיִּשָּׁלַח.<sup>25</sup> RLk changed it for another, more current Se-

<sup>20</sup>Thus also Albright-Mann, Mt 130; cf. also Schürmann, Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen 234. Both left out ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

<sup>21</sup>Thus also Schürmann, op.cit. 234, who also considers Mt to have preserved the oldest form.

<sup>22</sup>Here ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν could have served to precise that the logion applies only to this world's existence, not to that in the Kingdom. The addition, if it was such, would have taken place in the Mtan text first.

<sup>23</sup>Never found used in the LXX nor in profane Greek (as far as I could check them). In the LXX the current expression is εἰρήνην δοῦναι (= וַיִּשָּׁלַח), which is the one used by Lk, and also in Jn.14,27; 2 Tim.3,16.

<sup>24</sup>Supplied by Billerbeck I, 586.

<sup>25</sup>Supplied by Schlatter, Mt 349, who also gives an example from Josephus, Ant. 1.98, where an abstract noun is used with βαλεῖν: μηδεμίαν δεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὁμοίαν βαλεῖν. Albright-Mann, Mt 130, point to 1 QGenApocr.xxii,8 where וַיִּשָּׁלַח = "to impose", "hurl".

mitic expression that is acceptable in Greek, viz. εἰρήνη δοῦναι.<sup>26</sup> It is not impossible that Mt took the expression ἦλθεν βαλεῖν εἰρήνην in v.34a from v.34b, where βαλεῖν is a misuse due to μάχαιραν.<sup>27</sup> The actual origin of this expression is difficult to determine, but it seems to be very ancient.

It is almost certain that v.34a was formed by Mt in view of v.34b in order to stress the point made there (but may also reveal community questionings), as we also find in Mt.5,17. It is a literary procedure serving to reinforce the affirmative statement. RLk wrote παρεγενόμην in lieu of ἦλθεν, as he did in 8,19 (par.Mk.3,31) and in 19,16 (par. Mt.25,20: προσελθών).<sup>28</sup> The changes by RLk in v.51 may have been made not only in order to improve Mt's text but also to avoid repeating the formulation of v.49a. This established a closer link between v.49f and v.51-53, so that the latter becomes the explanation for the former. That is also the way Lk used δοκεῖτε ὅτι κτλ. in 13,2f.4f. Since the link v.49.51ff would have been better without v.50, the latter can be thought as due to pre-Lk in spite of the Lkan vocabulary, kept by Lk as an indication that that which is announced in v.51ff had already occurred to Jesus.

The οὐκ - ἀλλά clause in Mt preserves the saying under study in a more primitive form,<sup>29</sup> as we already suggested. If it is correct that the preceding clause was formed by RMt in view of v.34b, then the latter is at least pre-Mtan, if not

<sup>26</sup>Black, *Aramaic* 132f, studies this expression. The Diat. Arab., itb, l, d, r, 1, 2, syr<sup>s</sup>, p, sa, read βαλεῖν, and D, syr<sup>c</sup>, read ποιῆσαι. It should be remarked that βαλεῖν is used with a certain frequency in Mt: 34/17/19+5.

<sup>27</sup>One verb governing 2 objects in an οὐκ - ἀλλά clause is to be found also in Mt.7.7,21; 9,12.13b; 16,12.17.23; 19,11; 22,32; 26,39, and in Lk only in 8,27.

<sup>28</sup>That is also the opinion of most exegetes, with the possible exception of Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 227, who does not think that παρεγίνομαι could be a Lkan term. However see Cadbury, *Style* 178. This verb is used often in Lk's writings: 3/1/8+20. Grundmann, *Lk* 271, suggests that παρεγενόμην and ἦλθεν come from a common Aram. verb, ܦܬܝܬ, and further indicates that Mt's ἦλθεν reflects that of Lk.12,49a. A common Aram. verb at the basis of παρεγενόμην and ἦλθεν is thinkable if we admit that either Q was in Aram. or its source (oral). In view of other similar changes, it is easier to think that Lk changed the Gk ἦλθεν.

<sup>29</sup>Thus also Lagrange, *Mt* 212, *Lk* 373, Schmid, *Matthäus u. Lukas* 276, Hahn, *Hoheitstitel* 167, Schürmann, *Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen* 234, and Légasse, "Approche" 165.



from Q itself.

Only in 10,34 is μάχαιρα used in Mt with a metaphorical sense.<sup>30</sup> The verb βαλεῖν was already present in v.34b, primarily because of the reference to the sword. This is precisely the point being made: οὐκ ( ) εἰρήνην serves to reinforce the affirmative clause in a typical dialectic fashion, as we have already encountered in Mk.2,17b par. Pre-Lk must have had the same logion, following v.49 --brought together by pre-Lk and attracted by the hook-words ἦλθον βαλεῖν,-- because the differences with Mt's text are all due to changes operated by RLk. The strengthened οὐχί (9/0/18+3, cf. Lk.13,3.5),<sup>31</sup> λέγω ὑμῖν (0/0/14),<sup>32</sup> --the expression οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν recurs again only in Lk.13,3.5,-- and very probably διαμερισμόν, the verbal form in v.52a.53a certainly being due to RLk (1/1/6+2), are all due to the pen of RLk. The change of μάχαιρα for διαμερισμόν is easily understandable as a desire to avoid any possible misunderstandings, as v.52 makes plain.

b. Open Questions. As we try to pull the results of our analysis of this verse together, we are confronted with a number of questions for which no clear answer seems to be available: (1) was Lk.12,49 already in Q and did Mt know it? (2) did Mt know the saying of Lk.12,50? (3) was the reference to peace already in Q or is it a Lkan tradition?<sup>33</sup> We can however safely assume the forms of this logion, as we possess them today in Mt and Lk, to be due to the respective final redactors. It is RLk who changed the form and some of the terms of the Mtan ver-

<sup>30</sup>The other five uses of μάχαιρα in Mt are in a real and concrete sense, and occur in the account of the arrest of Jesus (26,47-55). In Lk we do find it used figuratively in 2,34f; 21,24 and 22,36.

<sup>31</sup>Οὐχί ... ἀλλά is used 0/0/5 times.

<sup>32</sup>Without a preposition or particle preceding or between λέγω ὑμῖν. It may be worthwhile noting the frequency of other uses of λέγω ὑμῖν: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, 4/0/6; λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, 7/0/5; δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, 7/0/1; ἀπὸν (γὰρ) λέγω ὑμῖν, 28/10 (but never with γὰρ)/4; preceded by other particles, 7/3/7.

<sup>33</sup>Aside of v.34 εἰρήνη recurs in Mt again only in 10,13 (par. Lk.10,6), but is frequent in Lk's pen (14 times in the gospel and 7 in Acts). The expression ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, in Lk.2,14 being noteworthy. One may likewise wonder about the figurative use of μάχαιρα; cf. n.30 above.

sion, and not vice versa.<sup>34</sup> It is very probable that the Q-saying consisted only of an οὐκ-ἀλλά clause, preserved in Mt, and that Mt.10,34a is a Mtan creation, but whence he could have been inspired for its composition --from Lk.12,49? from the Q οὐκ-ἀλλά statement?-- is impossible to determine. Finally, Lk.12,50 is a composition of either pre-Lk or RLk.

c. The Reference to Mic.7,6. In v.35 the expression ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι is possibly a Mtan formation in lieu of a non-Christological introduction to the allusion to Mic.7,6. It is impossible to determine whether the hapax legomenon διχάζειν<sup>35</sup> is due to Mt or was already in his source. It is not impossible that instead of ἦλθον διχάσαι it read something like διχασθήσονται (γὰρ), a passive to which the Lkan διαμερισθήσονται could be a witness.<sup>36</sup> Not only is the heavy concentration of ἦλθον + inf. sayings in Mt very striking, but also the introduction of an allusion to the OT by ἦλθον is not to be found again. Church conditions, especially persecutions, may well account for this Christological-prophetic formulation, as well as for the allusion to Mic.7,6 (cf. further, *infra*). Since the first ἦλθον (v.34a) is very probably due to Mt, it is not at all impossible that the last one might also be attributable to him.<sup>37</sup>

Lk.12,52 is almost certainly a creation of RLk to introduce v.53:<sup>38</sup> the expressions ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (0/0/5+1) and διαμεριμῆναι are Lukan. It is a midrashic reworking of the second

<sup>34</sup>Besides the opinions presented in n.19 above, Bonnard, *Mt* 154, and Roberts, "Some Comments" 306, think that Mt and Lk constitute the development of two traditions that had a same source at the basis without any further literary contact. According to Légasse, "Approche" 165 n.1, there were two not identical sources. For Derrett, "Herod's Oath" 246, Lk's version is earlier than Mt's. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* 494 n.1, contends that "Mt.x.34-36 looks like a conflation of Lk.xii.49-53 (i.e. Q) with the passage in Micah."

<sup>35</sup>It is not found in the LXX, except in the recension of Aquila to Lev.1,17 and to Dt.14,6. It is very rare in profane Gk literature. Δ and D\*, by a scribal error, read δικάσαι.

<sup>36</sup>The fact that Lk has a preference for the passive (cf. Cadbury, *Style* 164f) does not mean that Mt could not use it.

<sup>37</sup>Thus also Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 227, Bultmann, *ST* 154, and Klostermann, *Mt* 91f. According to Schulz, *Q* 259, it was already in Q.

<sup>38</sup>Same opinion expressed by Creed, *Lk* 179, McNeile, *Mt* 147, Boismard, *Synopse* 285, and Schulz, *Q* 258f. To the contrary Klostermann, *Mt* 91, for whom v.52f have the original form.

half of Mic.7,6 (preserved in Mt.10,36).<sup>39</sup>

Mic.7,6 is only alluded to in Mt and Lk; neither is closer to any OT text known to us.<sup>40</sup>

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>Mt.10,35f</u>	<u>Lk.12,53</u>
כִּי־בֶן כּוֹנֵן אֵל	υἱὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα	ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ	πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί,
בֶּן כּוֹנֵן בְּאֵל	θυγάτηρ ἐπανασ- τήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς	καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς	μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατέρα καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ
כֶּלֶךְ בְּחַתָּן	νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς	καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς,	τὴν μητέρα, πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφη αὐτῆς
אִבִּי אִשִּׁי אִשִּׁי אִשִּׁי בִּתִּי	ἐχθροὶ ἀνδρὸς πάντες οἱ ἀνδρες οἱ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.	καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οἰκιακοὶ αὐτοῦ	καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν [ἔσονται ... ... v.52]

Comparing both versions with the MT and the LXX, an influence from the latter seems plausible, especially in Mt, as the possessive pronouns reveal. The first of the three members in Mt (v.35b) has been arranged in view of the following (v.35cd): ἄνθρωπος, instead of the OT's בֶּן/υἱός has been chosen probably under the influence of v.36,<sup>41</sup> possibly also to cover the meanings of son and husband. The pronoun αὐτοῦ was added in v.35b to parallel the other two. The choice of prepositions, however, (κατὰ in Mt and ἐπὶ in Lk) as well as the cases governed by these, is due to the governing verb.<sup>42</sup> The paratactic καί's in Mt are not necessarily due to the use of "a Semitic text," as R.H. Gundry supposes,<sup>43</sup> but are natural to avoid anacolutha

<sup>39</sup>It is interesting to observe that in Lk.12,6 and 19,18, 19 the number five is introduced where the Mtan par. has "two", and in 14,19 Lk adds "five pairs of oxen", and in 16,19 mentions "five brothers". In Lk we also find the number two mentioned in oppositions: 15,11; 18,11. In Lk.22,38 there is a question of "two swords (μάχαιραι)". Finally, in 17,34.35 we read ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ (twice), where Mt.24,40.41 has ἔσονται once.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. Stendahl, School 90f, and Gundry, Use of OT 78f.

<sup>41</sup>Gundry, op.cit. 78. It is to be noted that the it,syr<sup>sc</sup> and D read υἱός: evidently a correction based on the OT text.

<sup>42</sup>Stendahl, op.cit. 90. This point was overlooked by Gundry, op.cit. 78, who had placed weight on these details!

<sup>43</sup>Op.cit. 78, from where he concluded that "the first ///

since it is not a direct quotation. The Lkan version is an expanded form, each member forming a chiasmus. The expansion, which is of the first half of each member, is certainly due to RLk, as his introduction (v.52b) allows us to perceive.<sup>44</sup>

While Lk has omitted the second half of Mic.7,6, having obtained a similar --even more emphatic-- effect by his introduction in v.52, Mt has preserved a text that is identical neither to the MT nor to the LXX, but renders it idiomatically.<sup>45</sup> Verse 36 is hardly an addition made by Mt but rather is omitted in the Lkan version because of v.52.<sup>46</sup>

We may conclude by noting that for the most part, Mt's text is more primitive than Lk's and that Lk knew the Mtan text. At the origin of the announcements we are studying we have a collection of separate logia: Lk.12,49 + Mt.10,34b + a midrashic exposition of Mic.7,6 --these last two already tied in Q. To these Lk.12,50.52 and Mt.10,34a(.35a?) were added by the final(?) redactors.

## B. Form and Formative Factors.

### 1. Form and Formation of Lk.12,49.50.

It is at once evident that the logia we are now considering have a prophetic character. Lk.12,49 is a prophetic I-word, using apocalyptic language. It indicates, in figurative terms,

/// evangelist must have been working from a Semitic text in which the conjunctions were present, for the OT Peshitta has waw's exactly where Mt has kai's." Lagrange, Mt 211, and Robinson, Mt 96, also supposed that the MT was at the basis.

<sup>44</sup>According to Gundry, Use of the OT 79, "the expanded form of Lk is more primitive," for which Gundry refers to a study by G. Quispel (in VC 11(1957), 198f) about Logion 89 in the Gospel of Thomas. But, he should have observed that Quispel's conclusions are not mutatis mutandi applicable to our logion since we are dealing with an OT substratum-allusion and esp. since Lk.12,52 indicates the redactor's intentions. Similarly, for Grundmann, Mt 300, Mt has shortened the Lkan text.

Since for Lk there are five persons involved, 3 vs. 2 and 2 vs. 3, it is to be assumed that the mother and the mother-in-law are the same person, as most exegetes recognize. However, for Grundmann, Lk 221 n.7, and Schulz, Q 259 n.568, the daughter and the wife are the same person.

<sup>45</sup>It seems closer to the MT (= Tg Jonathan) than to the LXX, ἐν ὄνομα = שׁוֹמֵר, and οἱ οἰκιστοὶ αὐτοῦ is idiomatic (RMt's? cf. 10,25) for לְיָלִיכָא. Cf. Stendahl, School 90f, Gundry, op.cit. 79, and Lagrange, Mt 212.

<sup>46</sup>Thus also Schulz, Q 259. To the contrary Manson, Sayings 120, and Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas 276 n.1.

an aspect of the eschatological times inaugurated by Jesus' coming. Lk.12,50, likewise using figurative speech, is a prophetic saying about Jesus' impending personal fate. The form of both logia is identical: a statement followed by an exclamation of "emotional longing".

The formative "setting in life" (Sitz im Leben) of v.49 is a situation of anxiety; where it originated will be determined when its authenticity is discussed (§D).<sup>47</sup> Many exegetes consider it to have originated in Jesus' messianic consciousness. On the basis of linguistic considerations its origin is most probably Palestinian. Lk.12,50, as we already pointed out, was formed in view of a historico-salvific interpretation of Jesus' fate. It gives verbal expression --and as such it is a vaticinium ex eventu<sup>48</sup> -- to Jesus' awareness of his approaching tragic end. The ambiguity of the expression βάπτισμα βαπτισθῆναι, although possibly inspired on Mk.10,38d, may be intentional: figurative and sacramental meanings are interwoven.<sup>49</sup>

## 2. Form and Formation of Lk.12,51-53/Mt.10,34-36.

Mt.10,34.35a are prophetic I-words, using apocalyptic imagery and having the form of mission sayings similar to Lk.12,49. The Lkan parallel has softened the apocalyptic force and the apparent implication that this is Jesus' intention. The οὐκ - ἀλλά form in its present context does not have a dialectic sense,<sup>50</sup> as the framing v.34a.35a as well as Lk's emphatic οὐχί make plain. However, the primitive logion, i.e. v.34b by itself, may well have had a dialectic sense; the radicalism produced by the addition of v.34a.35a responds to a situation

<sup>47</sup>According to Rengstorff, Lk 166, McNeile, Mt 147, and Derrett, "Herod's Oath" 245f, there may be here an opposition to an Elijah Christology; according to Mal.3,24(4,6) Elijah would come to restore peace.

<sup>48</sup>Bultmann, ST 153, extends this judgment also to v.49.

<sup>49</sup>Rom.6,3f: baptism is a dying with Christ. However, there is no direct reference to a sacramental baptism, as Deling, "BAPTISMA" 96f, has convincingly shown. The logion n.10 of the Gospel of Thomas ("Jesus said, I have cast fire upon the world [κόσμος], and behold, I guard it until it is ablaze") has been left out of consideration for it is based on Lk.12,49 which it interprets in line with its Gnostic tendencies; cf. Schrage, Verhältnis 58, and Schürmann, Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen 234. The same holds true for Logion n.16 which combines Mt.10,34 and Lk.12,51.

<sup>50</sup>Against Gaechter, Mt 347.

of adversity. The allusion to Mic.7,6 maintains the prophet's apocalyptic-futuristic perspective.<sup>51</sup> These verses point to the eschatological messianic times which for Lk are near, as his ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (v.52a) underlines. Their "setting in life" was double. The expression μὴ νομίσητε / δοκεῖτε ὅτι indicates some sort of possible misunderstanding about the consequences of Jesus' mission.<sup>52</sup> It seems that such a misunderstanding had already arisen in the early Church from the experience of adverse circumstances: "if Jesus were the Messiah, the bringer of peace (cf. Lk.1,79; Jn.14,27; Eph.2,17; etc.) why then these adversities that plague us?". The adversities in question were certainly the persecutions, betrayals, and martyrdoms; this is also the topic of most of Mt.10. Consequently, it was thought convenient to point out "to its comfort in suffering, that Jesus himself has both willed it and brought it to pass."<sup>53</sup> That is to say, the adversities suffered by the early Church constituted the defining "setting in life" of v.34-36, and their most primitive "setting in life" was very probably analogous.<sup>54</sup> This suggests that it is not impossible that at an early stage Mic.7,6 was associated with, and helped to explain, the adverse circumstances that the early Church was living, i.e. that to the logion of v.34 was tied the allusion to Mic.7,6.<sup>55</sup>

The logion of Mk.13,12.13a par. ("brother will deliver up

---

<sup>51</sup>According to Hoffmann, Logienquelle 72, v.34-36 are apocalyptic-sapiential sayings.

<sup>52</sup>Thus also Bultmann, ST 155 (a defense against doubts or Church debates), Plummer, Mt 156 (in Jesus' own time), Grundmann, Lk 299, Mt 300; cf. further George, "La venue" 66, and Albright-Mann, Mt 131. It is not polemic at all (against Bonnard, Mt 154). Ἡ ἀποστολή + inf., although having the form of a mission/purpose saying, within its present context cannot be taken as having the sense of a directly intended purpose but rather that of an inevitable consequence; cf. Mt.10,22 and our discussion below. Such a sense is not rare in Hebrew; see esp. Joüon, Hébreu Biblique 518.

<sup>53</sup>Bultmann, ST 155.

<sup>54</sup>Schulz, Q 260 n.575, indicates that their "Setting in life" is to be sought in the Q community (Hellenistic-Judeo-Christian).

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Légasse, "Approche" 164f, and the subtle remarks of Albright-Mann, Mt 131. According to Roberts, "Some Comments" 306, v.52f are a Lkan expansion. The primitive οὐκ - ἀλλά statement and the allusion to Mic.7,6 most probably already constituted a unity in Q; cf. Hoffmann, op.cit. 5, 41.

brother to death, and the father his child, and children will raise against their parents etc.") is a midrashic adaptation of Mic.7,6 and was inserted into the apocalyptic discourse of Mk.13 at a later stage, the saying itself having had a separate existence.<sup>56</sup> Here we find an added indication that primitively the logion of Mt.10,34b was unrelated to the reference to Mic.7,6.

### C. The Primitive Meaning of the Logia Lk.12,49 and Mt.10,34b, and the Redactors' Interpretative Work.

#### 1. The Logion Lk.12,49 and the Lukan Interpretation.

From our literary analysis of Lk.12,49f we had concluded that, while the logion of v.49 is of a very ancient tradition, that of v.50 is a creation of RLk or, more probably, pre-Lk, and is possibly inspired on v.49 and Mk.10,38. The intention behind the addition of v.50 was to provide a key of interpretation for v.49. An exegetical intention can be deduced from the form in which v.50 was constructed, parallel to v.49,<sup>57</sup> and from the meaning of the baptism metaphor which orients that of fire in v.49. The adversative  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ <sup>58</sup> also indicates an intention to relate both sayings. It is generally conceded that, in the light of its similar use in Mk.10,38 --where it is associated with the cup of suffering,--  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$  is meta-

<sup>56</sup>It is not, however, a secondary formation of Mt.10,35f/Lk.12,52f, as Schmid, Mk 240, and Taylor, Mk 509, suppose; cf. esp. R. Pesch, Naherwartungen. Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13, Düsseldorf 1968, 133ff, 137f.

<sup>57</sup>In the first half of each the subject is Jesus but, in v.49 Jesus is the actor ( $\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ , a centripetal action) while in v.50 he is the one being acted upon ( $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota$ , centrifugal). The objects differ. The second half of each verse begins by  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$  and ends with a verb in the aor. passive, comprising an expression of deep emotional concern --but here again there is a difference: in v.49 it is a positive wish, but in v.50 it is rather negative. The similarities in construction have led some exegetes to conclude that both verses were originally together, thus Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament, London 1962, 74, Taylor, Sacrifice 165, Kümmel, Promise 70, Légasse, "Approche" 164.

<sup>58</sup>According to Delling, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ" 104,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is relational (= "namely") and not adversative, because it amplifies (!) v. 49. However, neither v.50 amplifies v.49 nor is there any imperative reason for taking  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  in a sense other than its normal one.

phorical for Jesus' sufferings and death.<sup>59</sup> In the OT and related writings βάπτισμα/ζειν is frequently a symbol of calamity.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, the verb τελέω, meaning to bring a task to its completion, is used in Lk.18,31; 22,37; Acts 13,29, in connection with Jesus' Passion.

Given that Lk.12,50 is a sort of Passion prediction, what is then the sense that was seen in v.49? If the βάπτισμα of v.50 refers to Jesus' Passion, then the πῦρ of v.49 must have been understood as related to it. Before its meaning can be determined, some observations about v.49 are necessary. (1) The fire is something positive: Jesus wants (θέλω) to see it kindled (contrast with Lk.9,54f!); (2) the use of βαλεῖν carries no destructive connotation, for which καταβαίνειν or βρέχειν are used (cf. Lk.9,54 and the LXX). (3) It follows the Passion event with which it contrasts.<sup>61</sup> The aor. βαλεῖν, may be futuristic (cf. v.49b). (4) It has a universal scope: ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (cf. eg. Lk.2,14; 11,2; 18,8; 21,23) contrasting with v.50 which is personal to Jesus. And, (5) like v.50, it refers to an event (πῦρ βαλεῖν), also referred to in figurative terms.

With these observations in mind, v.49 could have been understood as referring either to the pouring out of the Holy Spirit following Jesus' death and resurrection,<sup>62</sup> or to the ensuing eschatological divine judgment.<sup>63</sup> Which of these in-

<sup>59</sup>See esp. Kuss, "Zur Frage" 11, 13-16, and Feuillet, "La Coupe" 356, 381, and passim.

<sup>60</sup>The noun is absent in the LXX and never (so far) found outside the Christian literature; not so the verb. For a detailed study of the uses and senses of βάπτισμα/ζειν see Kuss, art.cit. 7-12, Feuillet, art.cit. 378ff, Delling, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ" 100f, and A. Öepke, in TDNT I, 529-535.

<sup>61</sup>V.49b expresses a wish, while v.50b a necessity. The relation between these verses is causal and chronological: ὥς ὅρου (50b), εἰ ἦδη (49b). Thus βαλεῖν may be an ingressive aor.

<sup>62</sup>Thus Grundmann, Lk 270, George, "La venue" 64, Légasse, "Approche" 166, and Boismard, Synopse 285. For Graystone, "I have come" 139f, and Feuillet, "La Coupe" 369, it extends to the Spirit's operative effect of charity; analogously Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 12: "Erregung [!] der Geister."

<sup>63</sup>This is the opinion of Black, "Uncomfortable" 118, Rengstorff, Lk 166, Schlatter, Lk 225, Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament 75f. For Schmid, Lk 225, Creed, Lk 178, Klostermann, Lk 140, Plummer, Lk 334, Manson, Sayings 120, Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 123, and Conzelmann, Theology 109, v.49 has the same content as v.51-53, viz. divisions. ///



terpretations (or both?) was in the redactor's mind is not easy to determine with certitude. The latter is more probable. In Scripture and related writings πῦρ, when used figuratively, pictures the divine judgment as well as the divine presence in theophanies.<sup>64</sup>

Originally, when v.49 was not related to v.50, πῦρ probably referred to the divine judgment (cf. Lk.3,16f par.)<sup>65</sup> which would also justify Jesus' mission. That is also suggested by the context in which the logion was placed, which was due to Q (Lk.12,22-34/Mt.6,25-34.19-21; Lk.12,35-48/Mt.24,45-51; Lk.12,54f/Mt.16,2f).

The fact that in Lk.3,16/Mt.3,11 the Spirit and fire are distinguished --the fire surely referring to the divine judgment (cf. 3,17/Mt.3,12),-- and that, when the Holy Spirit is pictured as a descending fire it is always ὡς(εἰ) πῦρ(ός), as is the case in Acts 2,3<sup>66</sup> and also in the interesting passage in the Test.Benj.9,4,<sup>67</sup> indicates that it is less likely that

---

/// According to Mees, "Jesusworte" 302, and Delling, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ" 108, v.49 corresponds to the demand for decision, for or against Christ, with the consequent judgment. Bultmann, ST 154, on the basis of the Odes of Sol. (24,1-4) thinks that v.49f might have originated in "the gnostic myth of salvation," where the fire pictures the final judgment and the baptism the consecration by the Spirit. For Zahn, Lk 516, the fire is the post-Paschal faith of the disciples which is the basis for the coming of the Spirit.

<sup>64</sup>The former is frequent. Theophanies are pictured as fire in the OT eg. in Ex.3,2f; 19,18; 24,17, and in the NT in Acts 2,3 (cf. also Hebr.12,29). See further V. Hamp, art. Π in TWAT I, col.457-463, and F. Lang, art. πῦρ in TDNT VI, 931-941, as well as Graystone, "I have come" 136-139, J. Kremer, Pfingsbericht und Pfingsgeschehen, Stuttgart 1973, 112ff, and Delling, art.cit. 105-108.

<sup>65</sup>Thus also in the Agrapha cited in p.82 (*infra*) and in the logion n.82 of the Gospel of Thomas. Similar opinion expressed by Montefiore, Syn. Gospels II, 495; see also Jeremias, Unknown Sayings 72, and George, "La venue" 69. A summary of opinions is given by Grundmann, Lk 270.

<sup>66</sup>Kremer, op.cit. 112 n.85, is opposed to any association between Lk.12,49 and Acts 2,3 on the grounds that, according to him (p.112 n.83), Lk.12,49 is to be related to the reference to Elijah in Sir.48,1.

<sup>67</sup>To be found in c (Vatican Library, Cod. Graec. 731), β (2d Hebr. version in Gk), and in the 1st Slavonic recension, but is absent in the Armenian recension. The text reads: "the veil of the Temple will be rent καὶ μεταβήσεται (c. and the Slv. read καταβήσεται) τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὡς πῦρ ἐκχυνόμενον.

The fact that it be a Christian interpolation does not diminish its interest for us.

πῦρ was understood as referring to the Spirit than to the judgment of the end-times. Furthermore, since Lk has reworked v. 51 so as to establish a close interpretative nexus with v.49, as the δοκεῖτε ὅτι ... οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν ἀλλ' form (also found in Lk.13,2f.4f), the change from ἦλθον to παρεγενόμην, as well as the midrashic addition of v.52 indicate, Lk is thinking of the nearness of the end. For him the fire, opposed to peace, is the διαμερισμόν. This had already happened to Jesus who was betrayed by one of his own! It is now the division, strife, on account of faith in Christ which is a sign of the beginning of the end.

## 2. The Redactors' Orientation of the Logion Mt.10,34/Lk.12,51.

We have already indicated that Mt.10,34 (preserving the original core saying) and Lk.12,51 were shaped into their present forms by the respective final redactors. Lk's change of ἦλθον for παρεγενόμην and the omission of the 2d ἦλθον are not just literary niceties, but reveal the intention to shift the emphasis from Christology to eschatology. For Lk, the adversities are a consequence and sign of the fact that we are well in the final times; thus he concentrates on the allusion to Mic.7,6 --note especially the ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in v.52! For Mt, the adversities were foreseen by Jesus and in fact they came with his coming --note the triple ἦλθον. While Mt's outlook is Christocentric and catechetical, Lk's is more Theocentric and ecclesial.

The μάχαιρα was used from the beginning metaphorically<sup>68</sup> and, contrasting with εἰρήνη, referred to some kind of unpeace. But, can we somehow precise its probable primitive sense? The sword is a term used in the OT and related writings (often literally) to indicate the in-breaking of the eschatological (messianic) times (cf. Isa.34,5; 66,16; Ezek.21; 1 En.63,11; 91,12; 100,1f; 2 Bar.70,6). It was part and parcel of the apocalyptic vocabulary. In Isa.66,16, together with fire, it is a symbolic instrument of God's judgment. Furthermore, it was generally believed that the messianic times would be times of peace, but

---

<sup>68</sup>According to Lagrange, Mt 211, and Schlatter, Mt 152, the sword referred to Jesus' teaching, as it does in Eph.6,17; Hebr.4,12, and Apoc.1,16.

that this would be preceded by judgment, by the sword, when the righteous are vindicated and the sinners brought to naught. Thus, it can well be thought that this logion, by referring to one of the most striking signs of the announcement of the (messianic) end-times (which precede peace), is referring precisely to this: the change of aeons is taking place with Jesus' coming and the inauguration of the Kingdom which he announced. This would also explain why Mt could leave out Lk.12,49. We are reminded of Mt.11,12 par.: "the Kingdom of heaven suffers violence," and the warnings of persecutions. Thus, this logion would have said "I have come to bring in the eschatological times." There was no question of a "holy war" of some sort, as O. Betz suggested.<sup>69</sup>

RMt kept *μάχαιρα* probably because it fitted the general context in which he placed these sayings, viz. persecutions and martyrdom (cf. v.16-33.37-39) which will be suffered by those who confess Christ. Lk has interpreted it, under the influence of Mic.7,6, as a *διαμερισμός*. The allusion to Mic.7,6 narrowed the scope of v.34 to the family circle. That the allusion to Mic. was understood to be explicative of v.34 is indicated by Mt's v.35a (especially *γάρ*), and Lk's v.52 and change from *μάχαιρα* to *διαμερισμόν*. As B. Reicke has pointed out, in NT times "the prophecy is no longer understood to be concerned primarily with an individual biographical situation, but rather with a general eschatological perspective"<sup>70</sup> which consequently was applicable to the NT eschatological outlook. Lk, whose v.51f are strongly influenced by Mic.7,6, is apparently thinking of his own times as the final ones, the end and the Parousia being near (cf. also 12,40.54-56). Finally, Lk's addition of the conflict between the older and the younger generations may indicate that for him the division is kindled by the older (unconverted) generation, i.e. by those in authority. Mt is less concerned with the division itself, which for Lk is important inasmuch as it indicates the nearness of the end of times, than with the question of an unconditional decision for Christ: "he who loves father or mother more than me ..." (v.37-39).

<sup>69</sup>"Jesu Heiliger Krieg," *NovT* 2(1957/58), 116-137; similarly Albright-Mann, *Mt* 131: "to make war".

<sup>70</sup>"Liturgical Traditions in Mic.7," *HTR* 60(1967), 366f.

D. The Authenticity of the Logia Lk.12,49 and Mt.10,34b.

1. Come to Cast Fire: The Logion Lk.12,49.

Is it conceivable that Lk.12,49 could have been uttered by Jesus? In order to answer this question we must examine this logion under the light of the most helpful authenticating criteria, as we did for Mk.2,17b.

a. The Criterion of Multiple Attestation. This logion is not attested (in any form) elsewhere in the NT. A reason for this fact may well be its outer harshness as well as the difficulty in understanding that this puzzling saying poses. However, it is interesting to note that this logion is not only cited by early Church Fathers (Clem. Alex., Eclog. proph. 26; Philastr., 156; Macar. Hom. xxv,9; de cust. cor. 12) but also that the Gnostic circles showed an unusual interest in the first half of it. In the Gospel of Thomas, logion 10, we read: "Jesus said: 'I have cast fire upon the world and behold, I guard it until it is ablaze'." In the Pistis Sophia c.116<sup>71</sup> it is written: "Du sagtest: 'Ich bin gekommen Feuer auf die Erde zu werfen' und wiederum 'was wünsche ich, dass es brenne' ...," and again in c.141:<sup>72</sup> "Der Geist dagegen zieht allen Seelen entgegen und führt sie zu dem Orte des Lichtes. Deswegen habe ich euch gesagt: 'Ich bin gekommen, Feuer auf die Erde zu werfen' d.h. ich bin gekommen, die Sünden der ganzen Welt mit Feuer zu reinigen." A related, but not parallel, saying is to be found in the logion 82 of the Gospel of Thomas: "Jesus said: 'He who is near me is near the fire, and he who is far from me is far from the kingdom.'"<sup>73</sup>

b. The Criterion of Language. From the linguistic point of view, we have already observed in our literary analysis that

<sup>71</sup>P.194,1.27-p.195,1.17, ed. C. Schmidt.

<sup>72</sup>Idem, p.242,1.30-33.

<sup>73</sup>Interesting to note is its understanding and antithetical parallelism to "kingdom". Origen, Hom. Jer. xx,3, commenting on this logion doubts that it could have been uttered by Jesus. Dydimus the Blind, Expos. in Ps. 88,8, also quotes this logion probably from Origen -- Origen cites it again in Lib. Jesu Nave Hom. iv,3. See the studies on this strange agraphon by Jeremias, Unknown Sayings 66-71, Perrin, Rediscovering 44-46, and esp. J.B. Bauer, "Das Jesuswort 'Wer mir nahe ist'," TZ 15(1959), 446-450.

Lk.12,49 is very Semitic and in fact it may be a Greek rendering --in a non-Lkan mode of speech-- of a Hebr. or Aram. original. This suggests that we are considering a very old tradition, very close to Jesus' time. See the retroversion in p.65.

c. The Criterion of Coherence. Since the original meaning of Lk.12,49 is practically impossible to determine with certitude, it is difficult to determine whether it is coherent with Jesus' teaching. However, its eschatological outlook is not incoherent with nor contrary to the overall eschatological outlook of other sayings, especially if  $\pi\hat{\omega}\epsilon$  referred to the divine judgment.

d. The Criterion of Distinctiveness. It is extremely difficult to find a convincing reason that could attempt to explain this logion as a creation of the early Church. Would the Church have created such an obscure logion? For what purpose would such a difficult and puzzling logion have been invented or put on Jesus' lips? To the contrary, the fact that it seems to have been incomprehensible at a later time --reason for which v.50 was attached to it-- coupled with the fact that it was nonetheless deemed worth of preservation, points to its primitiveness. There is no saying from among the Jewish writings that, to my knowledge, resembles this logion or which might suggest an influence from that direction. Finally, its unusual formulation and veiled prophetic tone suggest its authenticity.

Summarizing, all indications favor the authenticity of Lk. 12,49, i.e. there are very high chances that it be ipsissimum verbum Iesu and can be considered as authentic.<sup>74</sup>

## 2. Come to Cast a Sword: The Logion Mt.10,34b.

The possible authenticity of the oldest reachable form of Mt.10,34b, viz. οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν is likewise to be studied with the aid of the same criteria.

<sup>74</sup> The authenticity is admitted by most exegetes. However, for Bultmann, ST 153, it is a vaticinium ex eventu and (p.154) if  $\pi\hat{\omega}\epsilon$  = the Church or the Spirit working in the Church then it is simply a Church invention. For W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah 126, Grundmann, Lk 271, Kümmel, Promise 70, and Feuillet, "La Coupe" 368, also v.50 is an authentic word of Jesus (for George "La venue" 70, only v.50a is Jesus') on the grounds that it shows Jesus shrinking from suffering.

a. The Criterion of Multiple Attestation. This logion, which gives the impression of contradicting other logia, is not directly attested elsewhere in the NT probably because of its unmessianic tone. However, an echo may be present in Jn.16, 33: "These things I have said to you in order that you may have peace in me. In the world you will have tribulation,...," a logion that undoubtedly does not go back to Jesus but springs from the Johannine theology. Mt.10,34b may have been preserved because it served to explain the adversities suffered by the early Church, but it is equally possible that it was composed precisely for that purpose. It is cited by Irenaeus (I, 3.5) in its short form, as well as by Origin (Opp.iii,188). Like Lk.12,49, the same Gnostic writings also reveal an interest in this logion. Thus, in the Gospel of Thomas, logion 16, we read: "Jesus said: 'Men perhaps think that I have come to cast divisions upon the earth, fire, sword, war. For there shall be five in a house ...'." <sup>75</sup> The Pistis Sophia c.116 (cited above) quotes Lk.12,51 and goes on to give an explanation, followed by Lk's v.52 but not the allusion to Mic.7,6.

b. The Criterion of Language. From the linguistic standpoint, it is not impossible to think that the οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ ... saying be a Greek rendering of an older Hebr. or Aram. saying. In this respect it is to be noticed first that in its earliest moment οὐκ - ἀλλά most probably did have a dialectic sense (later removed by the addition of v.34a.35a): "not so much peace but much more the sword." And secondly that the Greek βαλεῖν is probably a translation of the Aram. מרמי, or more probably מרמי meaning "to set up, establish (a condition of)", applicable to both predicates, μάχαιρα being figurative and contrary to εἰρήνη. In Aram. the logion may have run לא צאת למרמי ולא שולם צל חרב. <sup>76</sup> If these observations are correct then it can be said that this logion constitutes an old tradition and that, from a linguistic point of view, it could have been uttered by Jesus. But, before a conclusion can be drawn two other important criteria must be considered.

<sup>75</sup>It is a conflation of the logia in Mt and in Lk; cf. Schürmann, Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen 234f.

<sup>76</sup>Thus also Albright-Mann, Mt 130. The Hebr. would have run: לא צאת למרמי ולא שולם כי אם חרב.

c. The Criterion of Coherence. At first sight Mt.10,34b contradicts other sayings such as Lk.1,79; Mt.10,13/Lk.10,5f; Lk.7,50; 8,48; 19,42.<sup>77</sup> However, the incoherence is more formal than material for, a proper understanding of the sense of our logion is primordial. In Mt.10,34 εἰρήνη, as opposed to μάχη - εα, is not the "peace of soul", the type given by the risen Christ and in his name to the believers, but is that type of external peace expected since OT times from the Messiah, i.e. a material this-worldly peace (eg. in Ps.72,6f; Isa.7,17; 9,6f; 11,3-9; 32,17; 49,2; 52,7; 57,19; Ezek.34,23-30; 37,24ff; Zech.9,9f; Mic.5,4). This lends support to our contention that we are dealing with a logion that had been formulated in typical dialectic fashion: it negates external peace without negating interior peace. It is furthermore coherent with Jesus' possible prevision of adversities and opposition, and with the parables on watchfulness and vigilance. Jesus appears as a sign of contradiction who did not fit into the mould of this-worldly expectations (Lk.2,34b). Nevertheless, it must be admitted that this logion does not square smoothly with the general tone of Jesus' message and his approach to men.

d. The Criterion of Distinctiveness. At the outset it must be noted that it is hazardous to think of this logion as a "borrowing" from contemporary Jewish expectations, for it is contrary to them. Judaism admitted possible divisions (family and other), but only as a sign of the nearness of the end of times, not as as the final result of the coming of the Messiah.<sup>78</sup> It must be admitted that it is not impossible that this logion be the product of the early Church.

It is not difficult at all to explain this logion as a Church product serving to give a Christological explanation for the adversities suffered by Christians, as is the case with

<sup>77</sup>See further Jn.14,27; Acts 10,36, and often in Paul.

<sup>78</sup>See esp. 1 En.99,5; 100,1f; 4 Ezra 5,9; 6,24; 2 Bar.48,32; 70,6; Jub.23,16,19; 4 QFlor.1,10-13; 4 QTest.1v Fragm.15f (ed. Allegro, JBL 75(1956), 184); Sota 9,15; bSanh.97a. See also in the OT Isa.3,5; 19,2; Jer.12,6; Ezek.38,21; Zech.13,3. In general see Reicke, "Liturgical traditions" esp. 355-361, Billerbeck IV, 977-986, and also our considerations in c.VII, p.329f.

Jn.16,33 (cf. also Mt.23,34/Lk.11,49). Nevertheless, it must also be said that it is not impossible that Jesus could have pronounced a statement like this one, on the basis of his own experience of rejection and his awareness of the fate of the prophets of old<sup>79</sup> and lately of John the Baptist. It is not difficult to conceive that he could have foreseen a similar fate for his own followers. As was the case with Lk.12,49, this logion by itself --i.e. without the reference to Micah-- is obscure, lending itself to multiple interpretations. Would not the Church have been clearer and univocal? Furthermore, the early Church was opposed to violence and thought of Jesus as the prince of peace (Acts 10,36; Eph.2,14f).

Taking all these considerations into account, we can conclude that it is not impossible that Jesus could have uttered a saying like that of Mt.10,34b toward the end of his earthly career when hostility was reaching its climax.<sup>80</sup> However, the possibility that it was a Church product is not completely excluded;<sup>81</sup> rather, in my opinion, it is easier to understand and explain this logion this way in view of its Christological density. It reveals a Christological outlook wherein Jesus appears as the Messiah. His coming was the dawn of the messianic times which are marked by acceptance/rejection and consequent judgment. It is a time of decision. To bring the sword appears as a circumloquium for the end-times which precedes peace itself. The perspective is therefore highly eschatological. It assumes the understanding of the "who" who speaks, and concentrates on the "what" he provokes. With the inauguration of the Kingdom come the adversities: a messianic paradox brought about by a paradoxical figure. It is, nevertheless, a logion of very ancient origin; almost certainly Palestinian.

---

<sup>79</sup>See Mt.5,12; 13,57; 23,29-35; Lk.6,23; 11,47-50.

<sup>80</sup>Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 232; Hoffmann, Logion-quelle 41; George, "La venue" 71; Schweizer, Mt 162, as well as Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 4f; Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 123, and Lagrange, Mt 211, among others, take it to be based on a genuine saying of Jesus.

<sup>81</sup>Thus Schulz, Q 260 +n.575, considers it as coming from the Q community, and for Bonnard, Mt 153f, they are "paroles du Christ matthéen" even if faithful to the historical Jesus. According to Hahn, Hoheitstitel 167 n.2, v.34 may be a creation of the Church on analogy to Apoc.8,5.7; 14,16.



E. The Significance of ἡλθον in Lk.12,49 and Mt.10,34(.35a).

1. ἡλθον in the Logion Lk.12,49.

In Lk.12,49a ἡλθον + inf. indicates a purpose for which Jesus says he has come. It has a definite sense of a mission, a task to be accomplished. There is neither a looking back to the totality of Jesus' earthly life inherent in this logion, nor is there any allusion to his divine origin. It is a mission that has a universal import (ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν), but which has not yet been accomplished (v.49b). Yet this logion, which is not Messianic, and more Theological than Christological, does not reveal Jesus' messianic consciousness, even if it could be proved that it was beyond any doubt uttered by Jesus. It would, however, make his prophetic consciousness transparent. It is not said that Jesus himself would "kindle a fire," but v.49b suggests that this is left to God's providence: ἀνάθη (a divine passive?). The fire, viz. the divine judgment, is readied with Jesus' coming and proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom of God but it will be kindled, i.e. brought into full operative effect, by God in due time. He knows that he has God on his side and that he is proclaiming God's authentic will, and therefore that he is bringing about the hour of decision, of "the fundamental option", for men.

2. ἡλθον in Mt.10,34.35a. In Mt the three ἡλθον + inf. clauses grammatically indicate a purpose. However, the content and present context forbids us to consider them as final clauses --as Lk also perceived it-- but rather as having a consecutive sense: what inevitably occurs, because of Jesus' coming into the world and being believed, is less peace than strife.<sup>82</sup> However, as we already suggested, the logion of v.34b in its earliest moment of tradition had a final sense. The bringing of the sword was an elliptic way of saying the end-times are at hand; it was an eschatologically intended statement and figuratively said what we could translate as, "the purpose of my coming is to bring in the new (messianic) times." It is one of the signs pointing to the inauguration of the Kingdom by

---

<sup>82</sup>See Zahn, Lk 516; Lagrange, Mt 212; McNeile, Mt 147; Gaechter, Mt 347; and Moule, Idiom-Book 143f.

Jesus. The apocalyptic term "sword" is therefore an expression pregnant with meaning. It encompasses the necessity to decide for or against Christ, and it implies an awareness of the consequences it entails --tribulations as well as judgment,-- as well as an awareness of the fact that the time for such a decision has come.

In v.34a ἦλθον + inf. can be understood as referring to a purpose or messianic mission, viz. to bring the peace expected in the Messianic age. However, this expectation is followed by the affirmation that it is not taking place: μὴ... οὐκ... ἀλλὰ...; it is unpeace that is brought about. In its present context, the logion of v.34b has been re-interpreted by Mt, and because of its application to the concrete situation of adversities, as well as the denial of an expected peace, it can no longer be considered as a final-clause. Even though the adversities were brought by Jesus, it is not because that was his primary intention but because that is the result or consequence of his coming, his proclamation of the Kingdom, and his call to decision. That is, with his coming (ἦλθον) comes strife and adversity: the world is split around and about his person, between those who accept and believe in him and those who do not. Jesus' mission is implicitly said to be to bring mankind to a decision or option vis-à-vis his person and message, and in him vis-à-vis God's salvific plan. Acceptance brings strife, enmities, persecutions, even martyrdom, i.e. the μάχαιρα, in the hands of those who reject him. It follows that ἦλθον + inf. cannot be taken now in any other but a consecutive sense: it is not a directly willed and intended but an inevitable consequence, and as such it is intimately bound with his salvific-historical mission. Hence, the form ἦλθον + inf. was preserved and even re-used by Mt.

From our foregoing discussions, in v.34a and v.35a ἦλθον + inf. is looking back at the totality of Jesus' accomplishment: it is the community's viewpoint.<sup>83</sup> It is not impossible that v.34b also portray such a standpoint.<sup>84</sup> The weight of the lo-

<sup>83</sup>Similarly Schulz, Q 260.

<sup>84</sup>There is no indication whatever that ἦλθον implies a reference to Jesus' pre-existence, as Plummer, Mt 156 n.2, assumes.

gia (v.34b included) is not on ἦλθον but on the infinitives of purpose, which is well underlined by the μὴ νομίσητε-clause. The one speaking falls into the background, even if one is led to ask "who is the one uttering such a prophetic statement?" The answer is presupposed and self-evident for the early Church.

Mt.10,34b, on Jesus' lips, leaves a clear impression of a mission-consciousness, of an awareness of the weight and impact of the message he proclaims, and the consequences it carries for those who heed his call. Here Jesus appears as one aware of being God's spokesman and of introducing a decisive moment. All of this points to the prophetic mouth of the Church as source of these statements. All three ἦλθον-clauses have an ever present prophetic sense: with Jesus' coming the final peace did not come yet, but it is preceded by a time of adversities. Jesus is the σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον announced in Lk.2, 34.

It is evident that ἦλθον is important for Mt: he uses it three times in a row! By this heavy concentration of ἦλθον + inf. Mt apparently intends to bring out the impact of Jesus' coming into the world. His outlook is definitely Christocentric and serves a parenetic purpose: with Jesus' coming came the call to decision and unconditional commitment; it is the time of the Kingdom and of judgment. Lk's παρεγενόμενῃν portrays Jesus' coming as a "public appearance,"<sup>85</sup> an epiphany, i.e. Lk is bringing out the universal impact of the revelation through Jesus. It parallels the universality of 12,49.

### Conclusion.

We have studied two ἦλθον-sayings, that of Lk.12,49, most probably omitted by Mt, and that of Mt.10,34b which was in Q and was faithfully preserved by Mt. Both originally had a separate existence. While the logion of Lk.12,49 was found to be almost certainly ipsissimum verbum Iesu, that of Mt.10,34b is by far more doubtful, even if it does go back to the early moments of tradition and is very probably of Palestinian origin. The obscurity of these sayings provoked the necessity to render

---

<sup>85</sup>See Bauer, ad voce.

them more understandable. Thus Lk.12,50 was coined (probably by pre-Lk), and Lk adapted Mt.10,34 to serve as an explanation of the difficult v.49. By the time these logia were found together (in Q ?), the allusion to Mic.7,6 had already been associated with them in order to clarify Mt.10,34b. Each of the final redactors reoriented the interpretation of the logion Mt.10,34b in the direction of the preoccupations their communities had, faced with a hostile world. While the Mtan tradition gave it a Christological orientation, Lk marked it with his conviction that the end was near.

The form of Lk.12,49a is that of a mission to accomplish, a specific purpose, and ἡλθον + inf. means "my intention is to ...." An awareness of doing God's will is transparent in this logion. Here ἡλθον does not look back at the totality of Jesus' earthly career, but does suggest the source of his mission as God-entrusted. There is no question of his "having come from" (God) either. The weight of the logion lies on the purpose.

The logion Mt.10,34b originally expressed a purpose, viz. to bring in the final times. It is an eschatologically (and messianically!) oriented logion which assumes an understanding of the person and mission of Jesus, as would spring from post-Paschal reflection. It is, in fact, from this post-Paschal reflection that it can be best understood as having originated in the Church's prophetic consciousness and placed on Jesus' lips. The experience of adversities must have played a significant role in the formation of this logion. In its present context, as framed by Mt, it can hardly be taken as a purpose clause for, the dialectic form has been obliterated through the μὴ νομίσητε-clause and v.35a. It has become a statement of consequence, that which flows from acceptance of Jesus' message and messianity and which is adversity from the part of those rejecting Christ. That is to say, the Good News and a consequent violence are bound together as a two-edged sword. There is something definitive in this overturning of the contemporaneous messianic expectations. Here, with the triple ἡλθον, it is as much the person of Jesus as the purpose indicated that are in the forefront.

- - - - -

### III. COME TO FULFILL THE LAW: Mt.5,17(-20).<sup>1</sup>

Mt.5,17-20 constitutes a block which undoubtedly is related to what precedes and is oriented toward the Antitheses which follow. Verses 17-20 may give the impression of constituting a coherent unity but the origin, problematic, and even vocabulary of the sayings that have been thematically chained together (as it is known that Mt is so prone to do), suggest that primitively they did not constitute a unity. We shall examine these sayings one by one.

#### A. Brief Historico-Critical Study of Mt.5,18-20: A Way Toward the Understanding of v.17.

The relation between v.17 and the other three sayings will be the first of our concerns. This means that we must study the literary development and "setting in life" (Sitz im Leben) of each verse independently before being able to reach any conclusions about their relations with each other and with v.17.

##### 1. Durability of the Law: Mt.5,18.

a. Literary Analysis. Of the four sayings under consideration, only that of v.18 has a direct parallel outside Mt, viz. Lk.16,17. A comparison of the two will help us to determine better the redactional elements in Mt.5,18.

<u>Mt.5,18</u>	<u>Lk.16,17</u>
ἀμήν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν	εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστιν
ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ	τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν
ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ,	παρελθεῖν
ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία	ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεραίαν
οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου	πεσεῖν.
ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.	

The expression ἀμήν (γὰρ) λέγω ὑμῖν is without doubt due to Rmt.<sup>2</sup> Not only is it absent in Lk but it is extremely frequent

<sup>1</sup>The bibliography for Mt.5,17-20 is immense. For this reason I decline giving it here. In our study of these verses, besides the classic commentaries, I have endeavored to take into account the most helpful studies.

<sup>2</sup>Thus also recognized by the majority of scholars. As Schürmann, "Wer Daher" 128, points out, Lk tends to keep this expression; cf. also Cadbury, Style 157. To the contrary, Jeremias, ABBA 145-152 and often, and Grundmann, Mt 146, ///

in Mt (31/13/6). It gives a Christological highlight to this saying and underlines the firmness of the statement that follows. It is also easier to think that Mt has added ἰωτα ἕν (the Gk equivalent to the Hebr. ' ) than that Lk omitted it:<sup>3</sup> the latter prefers the Greek to the Hebrew/Aramaic expressions in view of his audience.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the second ἕως ἄν clause is likewise due to R Mt, as most exegetes admit;<sup>5</sup> not only is it absent in Lk but it is also to be found again in Mt.24,34.<sup>6</sup>

Both ἕως ἄν clauses cannot have a temporal sense because that would be tautological: the first one is, in hyperbolic (Semitic) fashion, a temporal clause, equivalent to "never",<sup>7</sup> while the second ἕως ἄν clause gives the terminus ad quem in a modal and prophetic way: "till all be fulfilled." The first expresses a Rabbinic "dogma"; the second provides a Christological qualification. V.18d adds a new restrictive thought to the absoluteness of v.18bc, which remained foreign to the older Lk.16,17.<sup>8</sup> The reason for the addition of the second ἕως ἄν

---

/// hold that ἀμὴν is an indication of ipsissima verba Iesu. On this term see esp. K. Berger, Die Amen-Worte Jesu, Berlin 1970, esp. 71-74, and idem, "Amen, ich sage euch," ZNW 63(1972), 45-52, as well as V. Hasler, AMEN, Zürich 1969, 57 and passim.

<sup>3</sup>Similarly Schulz, Q 114, Schürmann, "Wer Daher" 128, and Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 234 n.28. To the contrary, Dupont, Beatitudes I, 116 n.2. For McNeile, Mt 59, ἡ μὴ κεκατα was absent in the original Aram. and is due to Mt who would have intended to harmonize his text with Lk's.

<sup>4</sup>See Cadbury, Style 154-157.

<sup>5</sup>To the contrary Davies, "Matthew, 5,17-18" 451, and Berger, op.cit. 73f, who are of the opinion that Mt copied the first ἕως ἄν clause from Lk to serve as an "Anhang" to v.17. For Schweizer, Mt 62, the first ἕως ἄν was introduced from Mk. 13,31 at a time when the second ἕως ἄν clause was no longer understood. In his art. "Noch einmal Mt 5,17-20" 69f, Schweizer conceived the addition of the first ἕως ἄν clause to have taken place on the basis of Lk.16,17, while in his first study, in TLZ 1952, col.480, he held that the second clause was R Mt's.

<sup>6</sup>Mt.24,34c has changed μέγας οὗ (Mk.13,30) to ἕως ἄν.

<sup>7</sup>According to Schulz, Q 115 n.156, it has a pregnant sense = till the ἐρχατον; similarly McNeile, Mt 58 (= εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). For Davies, art.cit. 453, it is equivalent to the present age, till the world to come; similarly expressed by Strecker, Weg 143, Descamps, "Essai" 163, and Bonnard, Mt 62.

<sup>8</sup>For Schulz, Q 115 n.156, and apparently also for Dupont, op.cit. 117, Mt's form is older than Lk.16,17 --leaving out v.18d which they also consider as due to R Mt. It is true that the present form of Lk is not entirely the oldest --ἐύκοπώτερον ἔστιν and πρεσβύτερον are Lkan retouches-- but certainly is older than Mt's in form and content and is closer to the form it had in Q.

clause is understandable in the light of the additions made to the logion of v.17 (cf. infra). Thus, the pre-Mtan form of v.18 read: ἔως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ

μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου.

b. Form Criticism. In its oldest form v.18(bc) was a prophetic saying about the Law, a Gesetzeswort. It expressed a fundamental Rabbinic "dogma" about the Law.<sup>9</sup>

The "setting in life" of v.18bc is, therefore, to be sought in a Judeo-Christian community where its "conservative" members held fast to the OT Law with all its prescriptions: μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου.<sup>10</sup> It can hardly be sought in Jesus' time for, he did not observe such a strict attachment to the Law, to every one of the details of the Law as understood in his time, as the disputes over the Sabbath rest, ritual purity, etc. reveal.<sup>11</sup> Whether the origin of v.18bc is due to a situation of conflict within a community composed of conservative/legalistic Judeo-Christians and liberals,<sup>12</sup> or whether it was composed of non-Judeo-Christian members<sup>13</sup> advocating a liberation from the Law in the name of Jesus, as the majority of scholars suppose, is in reality difficult to determine with certitude. What can be determined with high probability is that the origin of this saying is Judeo-Christian,<sup>14</sup> expressing a legalistic Rabbinic-like outlook about the Law,

<sup>9</sup>The perpetuity of the Law began to be upheld as "dogma" ever since post-Exilic times; see Ps.119,89; Tob.1,6; Wis.7,26; 18,4; Sir.24,23-28; Bar.4,1; Apoc.Bar.77,15; 4 Ezra 9,37; Philo, As.Mos.1,12; Vita Mose ii,14f.136; Josephus, Ant.iii,222f; C.Ap. ii,277; Abot 1,2; Shem.R.6,33; Ber.R.10,1. See also Billerbeck I, 245ff, and the remarks of Davies, Torah, esp. 54-76.

<sup>10</sup>Lührmann, Logienquelle 117, and Hoffmann, "Gerechtigkeit" 177, think that it is the Q community that is at its origin.

<sup>11</sup>Against Dupont, Béatitudes I, 136, Davies, "Matthew, 5, 17-18" 431ff, and Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 238, who conceive the most primitive "setting in life" to have been in Jesus' own ministry on account of conflicts with Pharisees.

<sup>12</sup>Thus Trilling, Wahre Israel 181 n.80.

<sup>13</sup>For a number of scholars the opponents were Hellenists of antinomic tendency; thus Käsemann, "Die Anfänge" 166, Schmid, Mt 88, Bultmann, ST 138, Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis" 60, and Schweizer, "Matthäus 5,17-20" 481 +n.8. Bultmann, NTTh I, 54, and Schweizer, Mt 61, suggest that Paul and his communities may have been in the background of v.18f.

<sup>14</sup>This is the opinion of the majority as well, exception being Banks, art.cit. 238, and those who find a "setting in life" in Jesus' lifetime.

and that in consequence it is pre-Mtan (possibly from Q).<sup>15</sup> The "setting in life" that occasioned the final shaping of v.18 is almost certainly, given its present context, one of confrontation between legalistic Judeo-Christian and antinomian elements. Mt adopted this logion --against the "liberals"-- but not without some reservations --against the "conservatives"-- which are found in the addition of the second ἕως ἂν clause and also in the anteposition of v.17.

## 2. Attitude Towards the Law: Mt.5,19.

a. Literary Analysis. In v.19 the (discernable) redactional elements are minimal.<sup>16</sup> The expression βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is Mtan (32/0/0), and the concern with teaching may also be due to RMt, as in 28,20. In v.19a the reference to διδάσκειν stands like an afterthought that barely fits together with λύειν τῶν ἐντολῶν. It is most probable that the oldest form of v.19 spoke only of λύειν and ποιεῖν, two related attitudes --analogous to v.17's καταλύειν-πληροῦν.<sup>17</sup> The presumed addition of (καὶ) διδάξῃ (twice) was probably due to Mt's catechetical and missionary concern. The introductory ὃς ἔαν οὖν may be due to Mt as well:<sup>18</sup> he tends to use a legal generalizing terminology. Thus the pre-Mtan form of v.19 run:

<sup>15</sup>For Lohmeyer, Mt 104, Mt.5,18 and Lk.16,17 come from different sources, and for Schniewind, Mt 54, it comes from M.

<sup>16</sup>According to Seynaeve, "La Justice" 69, the whole verse, because of its catechetical concern and softening of v.18, is due to RMt. McNeile, Mt 58, 60, thinks that it is probably "a later gloss". Most exegetes find no redactional traces in v.19.

<sup>17</sup>Similarly Schürmann, "Wer Daher" 130. Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 240, considers only διδάξῃ οὗτος to be redactional. Possibly διδάξῃ has in mind the ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν of the Antitheses. It is to be observed that Mt underlines that teaching is the disciple's special task: 10,25; 23,8; 28,20.

<sup>18</sup>Similarly Strecker, Weg 145 n.3. Banks, art.cit. 238, sees in οὖν Mt's "inferential" intention. We find ὃς (ἐ)άν 32/21/17, οὖν 57/5/31, ἔαν 56/29/26, and ἔαν οὖν 4/0/0 times. Beyer, Syntax I/1, 172f, points out that with respect to the dissimilarity between οὗτος and οὕτως in v.19a.d, "wahrscheinlich οὗτος aus οὕτως verschrieben und in V.19b wie in 19a καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτως zu lesen [ist]", a phenomenon which, he points out, is not at all rare, eg. in Mt.5,47; 7,12; 9,33; Mk.4,26; 15,39; etc. Syr<sup>s</sup> tried to amend this by introducing οὕτως in v.19d after διδάξῃ. However, all evidence is for the reading as we possess today, and if that is correct then we would have an added indication that the reference to διδάσκειν is a clumsy addition due to the final redactor.



ὅς ἐάν (?) λύση μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων (τῶν ἐλαχίστων [cf. *infra*]) ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται, ὅς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται

b. Form Criticism. The particular form of this saying, a conditional-relative phrase with casuistic exigency followed by an apodictic statement of consequent reward/punishment, is typical of what E. Käsemann termed a "Satz heiligen Rechtes".<sup>19</sup> This form of legal speech is frequent in Jewish halakic literature.

The original "setting in life" of v.19 is, like v.18bc, to be sought in a Judeo-Christian milieu, as its form allows us to perceive.<sup>20</sup> However, it can hardly have originated out of the same legalistic mentality. While in v.18bc the unconditional perpetuity of the Law in its totality is affirmed, in v.19 a breach of the ἐντολῶν τῶν ἐλαχίστων receives no greater punishment than being called "the smallest".

In its oldest form v.19 was concerned with one's personal attitude toward a certain set of precepts (ἐντολῶν τούτων): he who rejected them (λύση) was considered and treated as of a lower "rank" (ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται) than he who observed them (ποιήσῃ). For someone of Jewish mentality and background it would be incomprehensible that, in spite of setting aside part of the Law, one still could reach eternal bliss.<sup>21</sup> However, this theological problem was very probably absent: the reference to the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν was added by RMt. Originally, v.19 made no allusion to heaven but referred to the place within

<sup>19</sup>Cf. NTS 1(1954/55) and again "Die Anfänge" 165. For Lohmeyer, Mt 111, v.19 is built as the Jewish sapiential rules. Hoffmann, "Gerechtigkeit" 177, sees in v.19 a "Debattewort".

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Tilling, *Wahre Israel* 181 n.80: within a community and not in opposition to outside elements or Gentile Christian communities. For Descamps, "Essai" 168, Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 240 n.47, and Davies, "Matthew, 5,17-18" 431ff, the original "setting in life" was in Jesus' lifetime.

<sup>21</sup>According to Schweizer, Mt 62f, we should not take "smallest in the Kingdom" literally because it was composed for the sake of parallelism with ἐντολῶν ἐλαχίστων, and it actually meant exclusion, pruned by the expectation of the nearness of the judgment. A literal sense, according to Schweizer, is also excluded on the grounds that it would have been unacceptable for Judeo-Christians to think that even if part of the Law remained unheeded one still reached eternal bliss. He presupposes that the ἐντολὰς referred to are those of the Decalogue, and that Mt's audience knew that ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται meant exclusion without the redactor needing to change the terminology. This is, in my opinion, a questionable hypothesis.

the community;<sup>22</sup> it had an ethical concern (as also often in Paul). Mt added his concern with teachings and linked the whole to the Kingdom of heaven. Behind both stages of tradition we can divine a division within a community composed of Gentile Christians and a majority of Judeo-Christians; the opinion of the latter is given expression in v.19 in a conciliatory manner.<sup>23</sup> The differences between both groups are not with respect to the perpetuity of the Law (as in v.18bc) but concerned the observance of certain concrete precepts: one could think for instance of some precepts of cultual purity or even ethical ones.<sup>24</sup> The concern of RMt was most probably mis-

<sup>22</sup>Similarly Lohmeyer, Mt 110, and Feuillet, "Morale" 127; see also Mt.11,11; 18,17 par.; 20,20 par., where a similar view is present. *Κληθήσεται* has the sense of *γενήσεται* or *ἔσται* (see eg. v.9.45), as Klostermann, Mt 41, Manson, *Sayings* 154, and McNeile, Mt 59, recognized, and is not a divine passive as Jeremias, *NTTh* I, 11, proposed.

<sup>23</sup>Cf. Seynaeve, "La Justice" 68, who suggests a situation similar to that which arose in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15). See also Knox, *Sources* II, 19, and Grundmann, Mt 149. The original statement of v.19 may well be the result of polemics, not on the value of the Law (vs. Hoffmann, "Gerechtigkeit" 177, and Strecker, *Weg* 137 n.4), but on the necessity to observe certain precepts which probably were questioned by the Christians of non-Jewish background.

<sup>24</sup>While νόμος refers to the *הורה* especially in its legal content, the ἐντολαί are the individual precepts and translate *תוצא* and *ד"הרפ*. The Rabbis found 613 ἐντολαί in the Torah. The difference between both terms is clearly indicated in Mt. 22,36: "which ἐντολή is the greatest ἐν τῷ νόμῳ." See further G. Schrenk, art. ἐντολή, in *TDNT* II, esp. 548, and W. Gutbrod, art. νόμος, in *TDNT* IV, esp. 1059; also Sand, *Gesetz* 33-36.

What ἐντολαί were in mind is impossible to determine: we do not know to what τούτων referred to. For many exegetes τούτων refers back to the (ἴσα ἐν ᾗ) μία κεφαλή of v.18, where κεφαλή = ἐλάχιστοι figuratively. For some (Manson, *op.cit.* 154, Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis" 61 n.3, Torrey, *Gospels* 290) it is an Aram. idiom = "one of the ...," and refer us back to G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, 2d ed. Leipzig 1905, 113f. According to Montefiore, *Gospels* II, 51, τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων is a gloss, and Strecker, *Weg* 145 n.3, thinks that τούτων is probably due to Mt. Other scholars deny any reference of τούτων to v.18; thus Knox, *op.cit.* 19, Grundmann, Mt 149 n.41, Schmid, Mt 86, Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung* 67, and Lohmeyer, Mt 110. It seems to me that τῶν ἐντολῶν should be understood epexegetically. It specifies --perhaps at a period in tradition when the precepts referred to were no longer known-- which type of ἐντολαί were meant and did not lead to exclusion from the community or from heaven. Τῶν ἐλαχίστων could have been inspired by the reference to ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται. Thus, the problem is less to find out to what τούτων refers to, as which the "smallest precepts" are. These cannot have been those of the Decalogue (vs. Schlatter, Mt 158) nor the precepts bequeathed by Jesus (vs. Lohmeyer, Mt 110f, and Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 239), nor those indicated in v.21-48 which were ///

sionary, and the need to satisfy a Jewish and a Gentile audience must have played a decisive role. These elements thus reveal why διδάσκειν was so important.

Whether v.19 was originally in Q, as H. Schürmann has argued,<sup>25</sup> is not possible to determine with certainty and is of no great importance for our particular study.

In spite of their similar "setting in life", it seems that v.18bc and v.19 were not originally together. The following differences are to be noted: (1) v.18bc states that nothing of the Law (νόμος) will pass away, and presupposes an exclusion from the Kingdom if any part (ἴωτα - κεραία) is omitted; v.19 says that some precepts of the Law (ἐντολῶν) may be left unobserved without for that reason being excommunicated from the community/Kingdom. While v.18bc is radical and uncompromising, v.19 is conciliatory. (2) While v.18 is a dogmatic principle, v.19 is a casuistic-oriented legal statement. (3) The "setting in life" of v.19 was a concrete situation of dispute within a community concerning the obligatoriness of some concrete precepts; that was not the case behind v.18bc.<sup>26</sup> It should further be noted that the particle οὖν is often used in Mt as a hinge to tie two elements that previously were separated; it is hardly inferential given the incoherence between the verses. Thus, we can conclude that these sayings were originally separated.<sup>27</sup> However, given the redactional traits we have pointed

---

/// uncompromising (vs. Kilpatrick, Origins 26, and Walker, Heilsgeschichte 135). All we know is that they must have been of such a nature that they did not lead to excommunication. For a discussion of the term "small precepts", analogous to the Rabbinic "light precepts", see Dalman, Worte 92ff and Jesus-Jeshua, 64ff, and Billerbeck I, 249.

<sup>25</sup>"Wer Daher einer dieser geringsten Gebote auflöst...." in Trad.gesch. Untersuchungen 126-136. In spite of the erudition there deployed it has failed to convince the scholarly world, given the conjectural nature of the arguments put forward. However, for Manson, Sayings 154, Bultmann, ST 138, Butler, Originality 43, and Lührmann, Logienquelle 117, v.18f were already in Q.

<sup>26</sup>Κεραία is not a figurative term for ἐντολαὶ ἐλαχίστοι. The former is a rhetorical way of saying "the totality of" the Law, without exception; against Schürmann, art.cit. 127, 129, and those who hold the same for ἴωτα ἐν, viz. Klostermann, Mt 41, Ljungmann, Gesetz 48ff, Trilling, Wahre Israel 181 n.82, Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 67, and Feuillet, "Morale" 125.

<sup>27</sup>To the contrary, besides Schürmann, art.cit. (esp. 127), also Allen, Mt 45, McNeile, Mt 58, Bonnard, Mt 61, and ///

out, it is highly probable that they were found already together by the final redactor.<sup>28</sup> Verse 19 served to nuance and soften the absoluteness of v.18, giving it a halakic concrete orientation.

### 3. Christian Righteousness: Mt.5,20.

a. Literary Analysis. It is generally recognized that v.20 is due to RMT, serving the purpose of immediately introducing in a nutshell (like 6,1 for 6,2-7,27) the theme that is developed in detail in v.21-48.<sup>29</sup> The redactional character of this logion is not only discernable in the particular purpose it serves, but also in the terminology employed. The expressions λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι,<sup>30</sup> γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι,<sup>31</sup> εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν,<sup>32</sup> and the key term, δικαιοσύνη (7/0/1), found again in 6,1.33, are all from the final redactor's pen.<sup>33</sup> The expression ἐὰν μὴ + subj. (2d pl.) + a comparison + οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν is found again only in Mt.18,3. The "additional character" of v. 20 becomes patent once we observe that (1) there is a change from the apodictic 3d person (ὅς ἐστιν, v.19) to the direct 2d

/// Bultmann, ST 138, assume that v.18f were always together. A totally independent existence of v.19 is hardly tenable since τούτων presupposes a mention of such concrete ἐντολαί.

<sup>28</sup>Thus also Käsemann, "Die Anfänge" 165, Descamps, "Essai" 163, Strecker, Weg 137, 159, Trilling, Wahre Israel 181 n.82, 182, and Schweizer, Mt 62. According to many scholars it was RMT who joined v.18 and 19, thus Descamps, in Justes 121, Kilpatrick, Origins 18, Gaechter, Mt 162, Schniewind, Mt 54, Lohmeyer, Mt 104, 110f, Schmid, Mt 86, Suggs, Wisdom 116, Hamerton-Kelly, "Attitudes" *passim*.

<sup>29</sup>However, Knox, Sources II, 20, and Kilpatrick, *op.cit.* 26, are of the opinion that v.20 served to introduce 6,1ff and not 5,21ff.

<sup>30</sup>Mt uses the solemn λέγω ὑμῖν rather frequently (77/14/40 out of which 37/5/11 are with ὅτι).

<sup>31</sup>10/2/5; Mk and Lk always distinguish them by means of the article: οἱ γραμ. καὶ οἱ φαε.

<sup>32</sup>Cf. Mt.7,21(2x); 18,3; 19,23.24; in Mk only in 10,23.24. 25, and in Lk in 18,25. See further the uses of εἰσελθεῖν with an implicit reference to the Kingdom in Mt.7,13; 18,8.9 (par. Mk.9,43.45.47); 19,17; 23,13.14; 25,21.23. The expression βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν was already mentioned in n.19, above.

<sup>33</sup>The other terms used are not "typical" in Mt: περαιοῦν (5/1/4) --however recurring in v.37 and 47,-- πλεῖον (7/1/9). Ἐὰν μὴ may be due to RMT (10/6/3) as pointed out by Lohmeyer, Mt 112.

person (ὁμῶν); (2) while v.19 does not specify any exclusions, v.20 does so, i.e. it is not the external observance of precepts that saves (v.19) but the interior attitude backing these observances: the Christian δικαιοσύνη (v.20); (3) while v.20 refers to the "Scribes and Pharisees", v.21-48 refer to the tradition of "the elders". Thus, we may safely conclude that v.20 is due to the final Mtan redactor.<sup>34</sup>

b. Form Criticism. This introduction-word, in spite of its Jewish terminology, does not refer to any concrete situation but constitutes an exhortation to live the Christian commitment radically, as expounded in v.21-48, and is addressed to the community(ies) at large.<sup>35</sup> It is a concentrated parenetic exhortation. Verse 20 brings into relation the νόμος and the δικαιοσύνη to which the former should serve. It was added to v.18f by Rmt in order to directly introduce the Antitheses which develop, by means of some examples, the content of Christian δικαιοσύνη --in contrast with Jewish external righteousness.

## B. Critical Analysis of Mt.5,17.

After having examined, albeit briefly, v.18-20, we can turn our attention to v.17, the object of our main concern.

### 1. Literary Analysis - The Oldest Form of Mt.5,17.

The hand of the final redactor can be discovered in two elements: (1) the form of the logion, a μὴ νομίσητε clause preceding the οὐκ - ἀλλά statement,<sup>36</sup> which is found again only in Mt.10,34 (q.v.), and (2) the introduction of τοὺς προφῆτας.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup>According to Manson, Teaching 36, v.19f were in M, and for Butler, Originality 43, v.17-20 were in that order in Q, while Dupont, Beatitudes I, 133, seems to deny the redactional character of v.20.

<sup>35</sup>Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 67 and passim, and Walker, Heilsgeschichte 135, are of the opinion that v.20 has as purpose to challenge the Pharisaic nomism; but see the judicious observations of Strecker, Weg 137 n.4, and esp. Trilling, Wahre Israel 183f.

<sup>36</sup>Thus also Barth, "Gesetzesauslegung" 62 n.3, Boismard, Synopse 137. Gaechter, Mt 162, is of the opinion that Mt gives back his source "formgetreu". According to Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 232, the original form resembled that of Lk.12, 51: instead of οὐκ ἤλθον καταλῦσαι it read οὐχί.

<sup>37</sup>Most exegetes are of the same opinion. For Descamps ///

Whether the logion in its oldest form spoke of πληρῶσαι the Law is an open question:<sup>38</sup> the verb πληροῦν is quite frequent in Mt (16/3/9+16), especially in the sense of fulfilment of Scripture when introducing Erfüllungszitate, and could be thought to go conjointly with the addition of προφήτας. However, it is also possible to think that the reference to the prophets was introduced on account of the already present πληρῶσαι. It is noteworthy that we do not have the passive of πληροῦν, as is the case when an Erfüllungszitat is introduced, but rather the active voice (again only in 3,15 and 23,32). The particular nuance of πληροῦν here, as we shall see, differs from the one it has in connection with Erfüllungszitate.

The shorter form of v.17, i.e. without the μὴ νομίσητε clause, was the one used by Marcion, who inverted the saying to fit his anti-OT views. In Adamantius' Dial. [Rect.Fid.] II, 1784, we read:

τοῦτο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἔγραψαν, τὸ οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι· οὐχ οὕτως δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Χριστός, λέγει γὰρ οὐκ ἦλθον πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον ἀλλὰ καταλῦσαι.

Tertullian, refuting Marcion (cf. Adv.Marc. IV,7.4;12.14) also cites the shorter form. This use of v.17b by Marcion is all the more interesting in that, as M.-É. Boismard has pointed out,<sup>39</sup> he used almost exclusively the text of Luke, the only one he considered canonical. Since this logion is absent in the text of Lk we possess, it can be conjectured that Marcion

/// "Essai" 161, this is the only redactional element in this verse, while Resch, Aussercanonische I, 74, and Klostermann, Mt 41, in turn deny its redactional character. We find νόμος and προφήται together in Mt.7,12; 11,13 (in inverted order)/Lk. 16,16; 22,40. Lk speaks rather of Moses when adding προφήται, cf. 16,29.31; 24,27.44. Schweizer, Mt 63, thinks that the original logion did not speak of καταλῦσαι at all: this would be a Mtan addition (cf. Descamps, art.cit. 167). For an investigation of the Patristic witnesses see Zaphiris, Le texte de l'Evangile 233-240.

<sup>38</sup>For Hoffmann, "Gerechtigkeit" 177, Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 66, Strecker, Weg 144, πληρῶσαι as well as "law and prophets" are due to Mt, from where they conclude that v.17 is in its entirety due to Mt. In a similar vein are Barth, "Gesetzesauslegung" 62, Grundmann, Mt 142, Trilling, Wahre Israel 172, 173 n.31, and Sand, Gesetz 183.

<sup>39</sup>Synopse 137. See further J. Knox, Marcion and the New Testament, Chicago 1942, with ample bibliography, and the reappraisal by L.E. Wilshire, "Was Canonical Luke written in the Second Century? - A Continuing Discussion," NTS 20(1973/74), 246-253.

used a pre-Lkan text and that RLk left this logion out --as H. Schürmann contends.<sup>40</sup> The shorter form is also the one cited by Origin in Num.Hom.XI,2; Jos.Hom.XV,4; Mat.Com.fragm.97f; Rom.Com.II,13; III,11; by Tertullian in Adv.Marc.IV,9.10; V, 14.14; Ptolomeus in his letter to Flora, quoted by Epiphanius in Haer.XXXIII,5 (cf. also XXI,5), and in the Didascalia VI,19 as well as the Ps.-Clem. Hom.III,51.2 (reporting the gospel of the Ebionites).<sup>41</sup> Though slightly altered, it is found also in the short form in Clement Alex., Strom.III,6.46;<sup>42</sup> the Sy-biline Oracle I,332, and the Babylonian Talmud, Shab.116b.<sup>43</sup> These suggest at least one thing: the shorter form of v.17 was well in vogue among early Christian writers, and this probably because such a form was known from a source other than our present text of Mt.<sup>44</sup> Finally, in our study of Mt.10,34 it was also found that the μὴ νομίσητε clause was due to RMT.

One could trace the formation of our present v.17 through the following stages of development: the primitive logion was a simple οὐκ-ἀλλά statement (v.17b) which later was reshaped into a μὴ νομίσητε-saying, as was the case with Mt.10,34. Whether the present form of v.17 and the addition of ἡ τοὺς περ-

<sup>40</sup>"Wer Daher" 131f, where he argues that v.17 was already in Q and that a trace of it is left by Lk in his sole reference to "law and prophets" (16,16). Resch, Aussercanonische I. 73f, had already supposed v.17 to have been in Q! Similarly Butler, Originality 43, Bultmann, ST 138, and Boismard, Synopse 137.

<sup>41</sup>To these should be added Eusebius, Dem.evangel.I,7.1; Hilary, de Trin.11, Enar. in Ps.118 and Enar. in Ps.119; Aphraates, Hom.II,5. Other Patristic references are given by Zaphiris, Le texte de l'Evangile 235ff.

<sup>42</sup>On the value of Clement Alex.'s witness to a reading other than that of our canonical Mt, see the observations of Zaphiris, op.cit. 233-240.

<sup>43</sup>לֹא לְמִיפְחַת כֶּן אֲרִי־תָא דְמוֹשָׁה אֵתִית אֵלַי לְאַסּוּפִי עַל אֲרִי־תָא דְמוֹשָׁה אֵתִית on which see the remarks by Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 56f, Jeremias, Unknown Sayings 24f, and esp. K.-G. Kuhn, "Giljonim und sifre minim," in Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche (FS J. Jeremias), Berlin 1960, 53-58. The tradition dates of the 3d cent. A.D. Interesting are also the two anti-Christian uses of this logion by R. Isaac in his Munimen Fidei, and which are reported by J.C. Wagenseil's Tela ignea Satanae, II (Schönerstaedt 1681), I c. 49, p.380, and II, c.10, p.401 --Mt.5,17 is cited in Hebrew, in exactly the form we find in our gospel.

<sup>44</sup>In all fairness it should be mentioned that we also find the longer form in early Christian writings, thus Irenaeus, in Adv.Haer.IV,34.2 (but only the Latin and Armenian versions) and Cyril of Alex., Com.Zach.XI,14. However, these are rare and are outweighed by the frequent uses of the shorter form.

φήτας belong to the same hand is impossible to ascertain.<sup>45</sup> What seems certain is that the reference to the prophets is due to RMT, as is v.18d --which have a related optic.

## 2. Form and Formative Factors.

The oldest "setting in life" of this programmatic statement<sup>46</sup> is to be sought, either in the disputes with the official representatives of Judaism,<sup>47</sup> or in the debates between Gentile and Judeo-Christians about Jesus' teaching and behavior vis-à-vis the Law. The final "setting in life" (the Sitz im Leben der Kirche) is clearer thanks to the addition of the μὴ νομίζετε clause: there existed a continuous tendency to question the applicability of (at least part of) the Law. The prohibitive μὴ νομίζετε says what the emphatic "don't you ever think that" says. From a grammatical point of view the subj. aor. νομίζετε, preceded by the negative μὴ, indicates that it is a matter of preventing eventual false opinions. This suggests that the μὴ νομίζετε clause was introduced occasioned by the fact that misunderstandings had already taken place. However, it does not necessarily indicate that a situation of factional conflict is at the origin of this addition.<sup>48</sup> This concern with the stand-

---

<sup>45</sup>I can find no convincing reason for thinking that the present form of v.17 is due to pre-Mt. The conclusion reached when Mt.10,34 was studied strengthens my conviction that both, the μὴ νομίζετε form and the addition of "prophets" are due to the final redactor.

<sup>46</sup>Schmid, Mt 86. Jeremias, ABBA 183, calls it a "Thema-satz", while Berger, Gesetz I, 588, sees in v.17 a "frühnach-österlichen Hoheitschristologie mit 'präsentlicher' Eschatologie."

<sup>47</sup>Whether this oldest "Setting in life" is to be sought in Jesus' lifetime can be conjectured only once the probability of authenticity has been valued (cf. infra). That the original "setting in life" is to be sought in Jesus' disputes with Pharisees is the opinion of Descamps, Justes 121 (who changed his mind in his art. "Essai" 167), and Zahn, Mt 211.

<sup>48</sup>Similarly Trilling, Wahre Israel 171f, for whom μὴ νομίζετε is nothing but a rhetorical device serving to strengthen the positive statement; see further Strecker, Weg 137 n.4, Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 226, Grundmann, Mt 144, and Turner, NTGK III, 77. However, many scholars think that v.17 is apologetic, to counteract existing false opinions about Jesus' position vis-à-vis the Law, thus Schlatter, Mt 152, Bonnard, Mt 61, Grundmann, Mt 144, Gaechter, Mt 163, Lohmeyer, Mt 105, Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis" 62, Schweizer, Mt 63, and Boismard, Synopse 137. For others it resulted from actual community disputes, thus Bultmann, ST 138, Schmid, Mt 86, Descamps, "Essai" 167, Hoffmann, "Gerechtigkeit" 176, Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 66.



ing value of the Law must have originated in a mind of Jewish background.

A comparison between the "settings in life" of v.17b with those of v.18bc and v.19 reveals the difference between them. Furthermore, v.17 programmatically expresses Jesus' mission to πληρῶσαι the Law; v.18 is concerned with the perennial value of the Law in se; v.19 deals with the problem of observance of the "smallest precepts," and v.20 is attributable to R<sup>Mt</sup>. While v.17 looks back to the OT (become old aeon), v.18f look forward, to the turn of aeons. Thus, we may conclude that v.17b originally was unconnected to the verses that now follow it.<sup>49</sup>

### C. The Original Meaning and Posterior Interpretations of Mt.5,17.

Before being able to discuss the question of authenticity it is indispensable for us to understand the original sense of this logion. This means that we must endeavor to grasp the meaning of the key term, viz. πληρῶσαι (τὸν νόμον).<sup>50</sup> And, for the sake of thematic unity later interpretations of v.17 will also be considered. However, since it is not my purpose to carry out an exhaustive study of v.17 I shall be rather brief.

#### 1. The Original Meaning of v.17b.

Some observations will serve to orient us in our search for the oldest meaning of the logion of v.17b, which depends on that of πληροῦν. (1) No specific Hebrew or Aramaic (supposed) equivalent can serve as a starting point, for an equivalent can be determined only once the originally intended sense of πληροῦν has been grasped.<sup>51</sup> (2) The choice of the term πληροῦν must be supposed to have been intentional and not arbitrary. For this reason the specific meanings covered by βεβαίω, ἵστημι, ποιέω, τελέω, τελειόω, τηρέω, φυλάσσω, and the like, are excluded and

<sup>49</sup>That is also the opinion of most exegetes today. However, Gaechter, Mt 162, and Lohmeyer, Mt 104, think that v.17 and 18 existed together, and Robinson, Mt 37, Allen, Mt 46, McNeille, Mt 58, and Klostermann, Mt 41, think that v.17 and v.20 existed together and introduced the Antitheses.

<sup>50</sup>A convenient summary of opinions will be found in Dupont, Béatitudes I, 138(ff) n.3, and Ljungman, Gesetz 19-36.

<sup>51</sup>Delling, art. πληρῶω, TDNT VI, 293f, and Strecker, Weg 145, are of the same advice. To the contrary, Jeremias, NTTh I, 84, Descamps, Justes 116, and to some extent Moule, "Fulfilment-Words" 313-317; this leads to a vicious circle!

delimit that of πληροῦν.<sup>52</sup> (3) Since we have the active voice, and the shorter form of the logion is at least pre-Mtan, we cannot automatically identify πληρεῖν with the sense this verb has when used to introduce Erfüllungszitate (which uses the passive voice).<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, (4) the object of πληρεῖν can be delimited: νόμος cannot refer to the prophetic character of the OT but must refer to the legal one because καταλύσαι is only applicable to the latter. Were the opposite true, the addition of "prophets", as we shall see, would have been superfluous.<sup>54</sup> Finally, (5) since καταλύειν is used in a figurative sense, πληροῦν is probably also used thus.<sup>55</sup> Keeping in mind these observations, one can say that, in the earliest reachable stage of the tradition of this logion, πληρεῖν referred to Jesus' teaching about the OT seen from its legal-normative angle, i.e. it touched on Jesus' concern with the ethico-moral, not revelatory-heilsgeschichtliche, content of the νόμος.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>52</sup>That excludes, therefore, in particular the sense of "to perfect" (= τελειῶν) --as if the Law in se were imperfect. What was imperfect was its understanding and interpretation, which had concentrated on the external legalism and forgot the interior basic attitude, as is pointed out in v.20.21-48. Seynaeve, "La Justice" 59, Ljungman, Gesetz 60 and passim, Robinson, Mt 35, Feuillet, "Morale" 124, Plummer, Mt 76, Lagrange, Mt 93, and Dupont, Attitudes I, 142, take πληρεῖν in the sense of "to perfect". Lührmann, Logienquelle 117, orients πληρεῖν in the sense of ποιῶν, but see Ljungman, op.cit. 19ff. Descamps, Jus-tes 130, thinks that v.17 in itself = "observer entièrement" --but this is expressed by τηρεῖν.

<sup>53</sup>This means that the sense of "to fulfil", as applied to prophecies expected to be accomplished, is excluded: against Seynaeve, art.cit. 61, and Lohmeyer, Mt 106. See the remarks of Delling, art.cit. 293 n.45, and Moule, "Fulfilment-Words" 317f. Hence, πληροῦν ≠ τηρεῖν; cf. Ljungman, op.cit. 26-33.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Trilling, Wahre Israel 178, and Hummel, Auseinandersetzung 135. Against Suggs, Wisdom 118, and Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, 56f.

<sup>55</sup>Delling, art.cit. 293 n.45. Against Ljungman, op.cit. 17, 60f, who takes καταλύσαι almost literally. It is also to be noted that καταλύσαι is not equivalent to καταργέω or to ἀκυρῶν. Hamerton-Kelly, "Attitudes" 26, wrote, with respect to καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον, that this is "an exaggeration ... too strong a description ... this is the sort of word a legalistically fanatic would coin." He is evidently taking καταλύσαι in its narrowest literal sense.

<sup>56</sup>We rejoin the conclusion reached by Trilling, op.cit. 178. Similarly also Strecker, Weg 144, Davies, "Matthew, 5, 17-18" 430, Hoffmann, Logienquelle 178, and Moule, art.cit. 317.

The primitive sense of πληρῶσαι (τὸν νόμον) could hardly have been that of accomplishing or obediently fulfilling/keeping the Law's prescriptions, codified into 613 precepts. However possible that seems, more than that must have been meant; as a Jew, one would naturally expect him to keep the Law and, in that case, such a logion as v.17b would have been superfluous. This logion has its root, therefore, in the impression gained that Jesus had not been totally abiding by the Law. There is no doubt that this impression was justified: he ate with sinners, did not keep the Sabbath as regulated, etc., and the clashes with Law-abiding Jews served to sharpen the picture. This image of Jesus also contributed to his condemnation and eventually his death.

What was then the meaning of πληρῶσαι? Evidently it was not to abrogate or abolish, nor to substitute the Law with a nova lex,<sup>57</sup> nor to preserve or confirm the understanding of the Law that Judaism had developed. From the behavior of Jesus, especially his conflicts with Jews, where an implicit Christology is discernable, the principle on which Jesus acted and which he defended was the primacy of love. Love of neighbor was presented as the authentic expression of love of God. That was for Jesus the first precept and all the others are meant to serve this one; that was for him God's intended will.<sup>58</sup> The pregnant πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον meant to give the intended place and value to the Law, and to subordinate all precepts to the principle of love. It points to a qualitative, not a quantitative re-appraisal of the Law.<sup>59</sup> That had already been the problematic of Lev.19 when it added to the negative precepts of Ex.20 (cf. Deut.5) that of love of neighbor (v.18; cf. also Hos.4,2).<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>There is no question of a "new Torah" as Davies, "Matthew, 5,17-18" 450, and Feuillet, "Morale" 125f, insinuate. See in this respect Trilling, Wahre Israel 178f, Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis" 63f, 143-149, and Strecker, Weg 146f.

<sup>58</sup>See esp. Schweizer, "Matth.5,17-20" 482f, Strecker, Weg 147, and Barth, art.cit. 70-80.

<sup>59</sup>There is no question of adding new precepts to the Law, and therefore πληρῶσαι ≠ ἵνα, as Jeremias, NTTh I 84, Schweizer, art.cit. 485 n.5, and Dupont, Béatitudes I, 142, hold; this is the sense of v.17 when it was related to v.21ff (cf. infra).

<sup>60</sup>Cf. Boismard, Synopse 137. He interprets v.17b in the light of "The Two Ways".

Fulfilment of the νόμος by fulfilling the law of love was also what Paul proclaimed, --in terms that echo Mt.5,17b.-- when he wrote to the Romans: ... ὁ (γὰρ) ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἑτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. ... πλήρωμα (οὖν) νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη (13,8ff), and in his letter to the Galatians: ὁ (γὰρ) πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν (5,14 [= Lev.19,18!]; see also Mt.5,43; 7,12; 19,19; 22,39f; Lk.10,27; Gal.6,2; Jam.2,8).

The logion Mt.5,17b had a dialectic outlook, as its construction already suggests. The negative clause meant "not so much to abrogate" implying that, although that is not the main intention, there is an abrogation of whatever precept(s) is an obstacle for the accomplishment of that of love. The positive clause meant "to revalue the Law by restituting the primacy to the principle of love."

## 2. The Meaning of v.17 in the light of the Antitheses.

When v.17b was associated with the Antitheses in pre-Mt (or Q?), it acquired an added significance. The key term πληροῦν found its explicitation in the Antitheses. What was it?

In the light of the Antitheses, where we find "You have heard ... but I say to you...", as a rhythmic refrain, the opposition established is that between the external observance of the Law and a radical new exigency that touches the heart of man. The radicality of God's will, to which the examples brought forth in the Antitheses point, is a "new" aspect of the commandment of love. Πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον came to mean "to complete, deepen, perfect" the Law, in a word, "to fulfill in the sense that He revealed the ultimate intention of the Law or uncovered its radically absolute meaning."<sup>61</sup> This becomes most clear in the last antithesis (v.43-47): one should love even his enemies!

The Law is not done away with, it remains at the basis of Jesus' perfecting, but at the same time there is implied that an aspect of the Law had been left unfulfilled. There is a continuity and a discontinuity with the OT Law that reveals

---

<sup>61</sup>Davies, "Matthew, 5,17-18" 439; see also McNeile, Mt 58, Descamps, Justes 129ff, Trilling, Wahre Israel 179, Strecker, Weg 147, Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 231; against Hamerton-Kelly, "Attitudes" 24.

itself in the authoritative relativisation of the Rabbinic tradition chain (ἐξερέθη ...) and in the unveiling of the radicality of God's will (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ...). Jesus' teaching is valued as a re-orientation of the Law in the direction of God's authentic will, which is addressed to the heart of man, and now is unveiled by God's envoy. Without the reference to the prophets and as a preface to the Antitheses, πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον was understood to take place primarily in and through Jesus' teaching, not his deeds.<sup>62</sup>

It can therefore be said that πληροῦν keeps its fundamental meaning of "to fill" (= ἔλιν).<sup>63</sup> V.17b says that Jesus had the mission to make known the will of God and, with respect to the Law, that meant to unveil its spirit. This innermost dimension of the Law had been veiled by the heavy concentration on the letter of it. The Law is not modified but its radicality as expression of God's will is brought to the front; an attitude different to the one hitherto demanded by official Judaism is required --one which gives primacy to the "heart" and relativizes the external ritual-like observances (v.21-45; 15, 1-20; etc.), to the commandment of love and not the multiple precepts for their own sake. The Law is therefore envisaged as a guide and instrument for the implantation of God's salvific will which was set forth through Jesus: πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον.<sup>64</sup>

We now gain a new understanding of the expression οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι (τὸν νόμον). Even if the Law in its essence is preserved, the traditions of "the elders" and the current inter-

<sup>62</sup>Cf. Trilling, Wahre Israel 176f; Davies, "Matthew, 5, 17-18" 430; Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis" 64; Strecker, Weg 147; Klostermann, Mt 40f; McNeile, Mt 58. For Lohmeyer, Mt 106; Schlatter, Mt 154; Schweizer, "Noch einmal" 71; Descamps, Justes 130f, and Dellling, TDNT VI, 294, πληροῦν takes place primarily through Jesus' deeds; but, as we shall see, this aspect comes into the picture only with Mt's addition of "prophets" and of v.18d. This means that πληροῦν here differs from that in 3,15.

<sup>63</sup>The Hebr. ἔλιν is therefore the most appropriate equivalent. The LXX translated ἔλιν mostly by πληροῦν (ca.70x) and the Tg rendered it by פִּלְפֵּל (on which see Ljungman, Gesetz 28, 32). See Descamps, Justes 123ff, and Moule, "Fulfillment-Words" 308-318.

<sup>64</sup>See Barth, art.cit. esp. 138, and Trilling, op.cit. 178f, 202-211.

pretations of the Law are subordinated in order to make room for a return to God's authentic will. Thus, given the continuity and discontinuity that πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον implies, οὐκ ἦλθεν καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον does not simply mean "to abrogate the Law" but "to abrogate the Law in the way you think."<sup>65</sup> We have already encountered a similar understanding in Mt.10,34 (q.v.). In fact, Judaism expected a definite interpretation of the Law at the end (messianic)-times: the Messiah would bring out the full and complete force of the Law.<sup>66</sup>

### 3. The Final Matthean Redactor's Outlook.

With the addition of ἡ<sup>67</sup> τοὺς προφῆτας a new dimension was brought into the picture. Not only did it explicitate (and expand) the νόμος as referring to the whole body of (Jewish) Scripture,<sup>68</sup> but it also amplified the aspect under which it was considered by v.17b to include the prophetic one, as the addition of the 2d ἕως ἂν clause in v.18 indicates. That RMT intended, by the addition of "prophets", to include the prophetic character of the OT is further indicated by what I have suggested was the inspiring element for this addition, viz. the verb πληροῦν which Mt so often used to introduce Erfüllungszitate. If νόμος already covered the normative-ethical content of Scripture then, to have added "prophets" only to produce the terminus technicus for the whole of Scripture in v.17 and not to have done so in v.18, would have been strange and even superfluous unless he had the prophetic aspect of the OT in mind. But, in order to better grasp the content and implications of

<sup>65</sup> Similarly Ljungman, Gesetz 11.

<sup>66</sup> See esp. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, and Schäfer, "Die Torah der messianischen Zeit"; further Billerbeck IV/1, 1ff. and Isa.2,3; 59,21; Jer.31,31ff; Ez.36,25ff; CD 7,5; 12,23; 14,19.

<sup>67</sup> ἡ does not have a disjunctive sense, but is used on account of the negative sentence; it has the same function the conj. καὶ has in an affirmative one. Cf. F.-M. Abel, Grammaire du Grec Biblique, Paris 1927, §78(i), and E. Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, II/3, Berlin-Leipzig 1934, 138 (with examples). See also Jn.8,14 and Acts 1,7; 11,8. Syr<sup>s,c</sup>, Hilary, and Aphraates read "and". On the contrary, Bl-D §445(2) takes it to be disjunctive, equivalent to οὔτε ... οὔτε ....

<sup>68</sup> On the meaning of the expression "law and prophets" see esp. Berger, Gesetzesauslegung I, 209-224. He promises a thorough study of Mt.5,17ff in his forthcoming vol.II.

Mt's addition of "the prophets" we must grasp that of v.18d for, as we already indicated, they were added at the same time and are closely related: Mt rooted v.17 in v.18 --to be noted are the causative γάρ and the solemn ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν.

In the expression ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται, in v.18d, the verb γίνομαι has the meaning of "to happen, occur," as it does elsewhere in Mt (73x); only in 6,10 and 26,42 does it have the sense of "doing" (the will of the Father).<sup>69</sup> The same expression recurs only in 24,34/Mk.13,30(μέχρις οὗ)/Lk.21,32(+ αὕτη),<sup>70</sup> where it refers, in prophetic manner, to the events that announce the nearness of the Parousia. Thus, we have to deal with a terminus ad quem.<sup>71</sup> Πάντα (γένηται) very probably refers, in Mt's mind and intention, to πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας,<sup>72</sup> i.e. the full realization of God's will in and through Jesus Christ and his followers, as indicated in 3,15 (πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην), 28,20a (διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν), and in 23,3.

Not only is the language of v.18d prophetic, but also the expression τοῦτο ( ) γέγοθεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ occurs in 1,22; 21,4; 26,56 (cf. also 26,54), with reference to "the prophet(s)".<sup>73</sup> From here that γένηται and πληρῶσαι τοὺς προφήτας were probably meant by Mt to be understood as mutually explicative. Hence,

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Ljungman, Gesetz 54f, and Bauer, ad voce.

<sup>70</sup>Πάντα γίνομαι is also found in Mt.18,31b and Mk.4,11 (omitted in the Mt and Mk par.); cf. also Jos.21,45:

<sup>71</sup>See esp. Beyer, Syntax I/1, 132f n.1; differently Honeyman, "Matthew" 142. We have already indicated that the first ἕως ἂν clause imposes no temporal limitation to the perennity of the Law, being a circumloquium for "never"; the 2d ἕως ἂν clause does, at least implicitly --there is no tautology involved then. The indication of a limitation inherent in the 2d ἕως ἂν clause is recognized by a good number of exegetes also. But, for Feuillet, "Morale" 125, Schniewind, Mt 54, von Sybel, "Vom Wachsen" 380, Seynaeve, "La Justice" 61, 65, Dupont, Beatitudes I, 135, the limit is the Jesus-event, while for Davies, "Matthew" 451 and Hamerton-Kelly, "Attitudes" 21, 30, the limit is found in Jesus' death (and resurrection)! Bonnard, Mt 62, Allen, Mt 47, Klostermann, Mt 41, Knox, Sources II, 19, Schweizer, "Noch einmal" 70, McNeile, Mt 59, and Ljungman, Gesetz 47, see the limit in the end of the world or the Parousia. However, it should be observed that πάντα ≠ final events.

<sup>72</sup>Descamps, "Essai" 162, Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate 52, Schweizer, "Matth.5,17-20" 481, Trilling, Wahre Israel 170, and esp. Ljungman, op.cit. 54-59, which is formally contested by Strecker, Weg 144.

<sup>73</sup>Never in Mk and Lk/Acts, but in the late Jn.19,36.

v.18d does not refer to the end-events or to the Parousia, but to the goal and the finality of the "Law and Prophets"; it is thus implied that the "road" that leads to the goal is also contemplated.<sup>74</sup> When the goal, i.e. God's will, is fully achieved it can be said that then all that must γένηται has taken place.<sup>75</sup> Since γίνομαι refers to "events" it is understood that alongside Jesus' (and his followers') teaching his deeds are also contemplated, i.e. the REALization through praxis.<sup>76</sup> Mt is contemplating the πάντα γένηται not only under the aspect of πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον, which the pre-Mtan v.17b had painted, but also --and this through his addition of "prophets"-- under that of πληρῶσαι τοὺς προφῆτας through Jesus Christ and his followers,<sup>77</sup> i.e. the total and all encompassing (πάντα) realization of God's will which is the end-purpose of all events.<sup>78</sup>

Therefore, RMt has injected a (salvific-) historical dimension with an eschatological outlook --which is one of the traits of his gospel.<sup>79</sup> The outlook expressed in v.17 can be well summarized in P. Hoffmann's words: "Für den Evangelisten gehören Erfüllungsaussage und Gerechtigkeitsforderung zusammen; Jesus erfüllt die prophetische Verheissung so, dass in ihr die Gerechtigkeitsforderung des Gesetzes erfüllt wird. Die Erfüllung der Verheissung in seiner Person (die heilsgeschichtliche-christologische Erfüllung) ist zugleich eine ethisch-exemplarische Tora-Erfüllung."<sup>80</sup>

<sup>74</sup>Barth, "Gesetzesauslegung" 65; Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate 52; A. Vögtle, Das Neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos, Düsseldorf 1970, 105f.

<sup>75</sup>This corroborates the understanding of the Law (and Prophets) expressed in v.17, viz. that it exists for and as instrument of the implantation of God's will, which is Jesus' mission.

<sup>76</sup>Denied by Strecker, Weg 144. I fail to see why v.18b would forbid thinking of Jesus' deeds. Strecker does admit that if v.17 is related to v.18d then one has to think of Jesus' deeds as well, which he rejects.

<sup>77</sup>Here we run into Mt's conception of the Church as the new and true Israel, on which see the study of Trilling, Wahre Israel. The prophetic aspect is acknowledged by a good number of exegetes; however, Trilling, op.cit. 169, 172f, and Strecker, Weg 144, consider it as referring only to the ethical aspect.

<sup>78</sup>Πάντα is not just qualitative but also quantitative, as γένηται indicates; cf. Ljungman, Gesetz 56-59, 67-69.

<sup>79</sup>See esp. Strecker's study, Weg, esp. p.86-122, 236-242.

<sup>80</sup>Logienquelle 178. See eg. Mt.11,28ff and 12,16ff.



#### D. The Authenticity of the Logion Mt.5,17b.

The question now facing us is whether the historical Jesus himself might have uttered the saying of Mt.5,17b --in its oldest form, i.e. as a simple οὐκ - ἀλλά statement, referring only to the Law.

1. The Criterion of Multiple Attestation. This most categorical and forceful logion about the relation of Jesus' mission to the Law is not attested elsewhere in the NT. An echo may be present in Rom.13,8ff and Gal.5,14, as well as 1 Tim.1,8. The Patristic witnesses to the shorter form which we brought forth, only indicate the extent to which this logion was used and that it was considered to be an important saying of Jesus. The same motive that led most early Christian writers to use Mt.5,17 could have propelled the early Christian community to coin this saying, viz. the need for a clear statement that Jesus' intention had not been that of abrogating the Law but rather to bring out its fullest and deepest meaning.

2. The Criterion of Language. From the linguistic point of view little help is found. The dialectic negative suggests a Semitic background. A retroversion into the Aramaic is always possible: לֹא אֶתִּית לְמִיפְחַת מֶן אֹרִיתָא אִלָּא לְאוֹסְפִי.<sup>81</sup> However, it should be noted that our logion makes good sense as a Greek expression as well,<sup>82</sup> and the linguistic ambiguities are present in both languages. It is therefore not imperative to presuppose an Aramaic original at the basis of our present Greek formulation.

3. The Criterion of Coherence. If we ask whether the logion of v.17b is coherent with what we know of Jesus' teaching and behavior, the answer must be nuanced. On the one hand, there is no saying that either advocates or suggests a derogation of

<sup>81</sup> Adaptation of Jeremias' retroversion in NTTh I, 27, 83f. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 61, proposed: lā limebattālā atēt ēllā limekajjāmā. The Hebr. would run: לֹא בָצִיתִי לְהַכִּיר כִּי צֶם-לְמַלְאֶת אֶת הַתּוֹרָה.

<sup>82</sup> καταλύειν, in relation to the Law, is found in 2 Mac. 2,22; 4,11; 4 Mac.4,16; 5,33; 17,9. Neither πληροῦν, nor any of its Gk or Hebr. equivalents, with respect to the Law, is found in the OT and related writings; from here that this term be given so many different senses by exegetes.

any of the components of the νόμος. On the other hand, there are sufficient examples of sayings and deeds of Jesus that reflect a basic observance of the Law. However, Jesus' understanding of the Law, from all evidence, was not equivalent to that of the Judaism of his time. That is what πληρῶσαι (τὸν νόμον) carries and points to.

There is no doubt that Jesus refused to comply with some of the legal prescriptions which, in his view, made of the Law an unnecessary burden (Mt.23,4.23, compare with 11,29f) or which were an obstacle to the accomplishment of the fundamental commandment --that of love (Mk.12,28-31 par.).<sup>83</sup> It follows that the logion of Mt.5,17 is coherent with the ensemble of Jesus' teaching and behavior. The νόμος is primarily understood in terms of and in service of the commandment of love, i.e. in terms of God's salvific will for men. However, it would have been most strange that this man Jesus, who does not keep all of the νόμος (in all its prescribed details) as it was understood in his time, would say that his purpose is not only not to abrogate the Law but to πληρῶσαι it. This sort of statement would hardly have been believed if uttered outside a dispute (precisely what is missing as supporting frame to this logion) and a longer explanation accompanied it, or if not pointed out by Jesus to his astounded disciples.

4. The Criterion of Distinctiveness. A saying like that of Mt.5,17b in which there is talk about καταλῦσαι the Law could hardly have been "borrowed" from Judaism! For the Jews it was unthinkable to do away/abrogate the least portion of the Law (cf. v.18!). The perennity of the Law in all its parts was a "dogma". We have the evidence of bShab.116b and Rabbi Isaac (see n.43) who used this logion to ridicule Christianity. Thus, its origin is to be sought either in Jesus himself or in the early Church.

We have already indicated that it is not unthinkable that this logion could have been coined in the early Church, and there would be ample reason for wanting to do so. The need

---

<sup>83</sup>See for instance Mt.9,14f par. (on fasting); 12,1-8 par. (on working to eat on a Sabbath); 12,9-18 par. (curing on a Sabbath); 15,1-20 par. (on qorban and eating with unwashed hands).

for such a saying, with such an apologetic tone, could have been felt in face of the objections coming from Jews as well as Christian antinomians. This programmatic saying concerning the Law, "quoted" without a reference to a concrete situation in the life of Jesus that could have occasioned its pronouncement, renders it extremely suspicious. It should also be noted that Jesus' main concern (as far as we know) was never the Law, i.e. looking back to what now was becoming the old aeon, but rather the announcement of the nearness of the Kingdom of God, i.e. looking forward to the new aeon. Such a concrete and direct concern with the Law as v.17 shows (so much that Mt amplified it!) begins with the early missionary community which, engaged in preaching the Good News, was confronted with Jews --among them prospective converts-- and eventually Judeo-Christians confronted with Gentile Christians. Evidently all of this does not necessarily mean that Jesus could not have uttered a saying like that of Mt.5,17b, but it does diminish considerably the probability that he actually did so.

Cognizant of all the considerations we have advanced and the different criteria have led us to, one perceives that it is by far more likely that Mt.5,17b is a product of the early Church, though reflecting Jesus' mind, than that it is ipsissimum verbum Iesu.<sup>84</sup> The chances of authenticity diminish once we take into account the fact that this logion asks about the totality of the Law and that Jesus was not directly concerned with the Law as such, nor with every prescription therein contained. The ascertainment of v.17 seems more a conclusion drawn from a comprehensive understanding that is read out of Jesus' teaching and behavior, such as is suggested by the gospel of Matthew. Furthermore, the accent of the logion lies on the theologically pregnant term  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\varsigma$  which suggests a Christology such as is developed in Mt, wherein Jesus is the perfecter

<sup>84</sup>For those who take v.17 to be due to Mt (cf. n.38), this logion is evidently a Church product. To the contrary, Manson, *Sayings* 153; Seynaeve, "La Justice" 59, 62; Lohmeyer, *Mt* 106; Feuillet, "Morale" 129; Descamps, *Justes* 121, "Essai" 169; Zahn, *Mt* 211; Banks, "Matthew's Understanding" 232f; Bultmann, *NTTh* I, 16 (! but see *ST* 149), and Barth, "Gesetzesverständnis" 62, contend that the essence of this saying, if not its formulation, goes back to Jesus himself.

of the Law. This term evokes a comprehensive salvifico-historical understanding of Jesus' messiahship. The statement is of such a nature that it leads one to ask who it is who can say this, and why he does so. In itself, the accent lies totally on the "what" precisely because the "who" it is who says this is known. This suggests a post-Paschal understanding of who Jesus is and a sure grasp of his messiahship.

E. Significance of ἦλθον in Mt.5,17.

In 5,17 we encounter the first and the most programmatic ἦλθον-saying in Mt's gospel. The logion's composition does not seem to have been accomplished by sheer chance but rather by design: one of Mt's concerns throughout his gospel is to bring out Jesus' position vis-à-vis the Law and the fulfilment of prophecies in him. This logion could serve as subtitle to Mt's gospel! On the basis of Jesus' position and teaching, Mt.5,17 answers a key question: the position of Christianity vis-à-vis the Old Testament.

As an isolated saying, ἦλθον + inf. in v.17b, on account of its content, means "my purpose is ...."<sup>85</sup> It is a statement of fact. Formulated in the first person, ἦλθον indicates a free undertaking. Having the Law, which is re-evaluated in the light of the precept of love, as content, the "public" statement of v.17b presupposes a sense of authority: a statement as that of v.17b with the implications it has can be conceived as fitting only in the mouth of someone in full authority to deal with the Law, as he then does in the Antitheses.

Associated to the Antitheses, v.17b, in pre-Mk (or Q?) presupposes a knowledge of the will of God such as a messenger of God would have; ἦλθον therefore approaches ἀπεστάλην without being equivalent to it. Taking into account the oppositions expressed in the Antitheses, the authority, implicit in our logion, finds a higher pitch: ἦλθον is analogous to the ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν of the Antitheses. Furthermore, in view of the new radicality expounded in them, to which v.17b served as preface, the origin of the authority and mission to πληρῶσαι, to bring the fulness of the Law's intention, had to be understood as

---

<sup>85</sup> Similarly Jeremias, NTTh I, 83.

having come from God himself.

With Mt's addition of "prophets" and v.18d we find a wider perspective, a salvific-historical one, wherein Jesus is definitely understood as being superior to all the prophets and as being the final envoy of God. Ἡλθον receives a Christological hightening, looks back at the totality of Jesus' dealings and their legal implications, and sees in him the coming of the Messiah. V.17 puts Jesus' mission to explicitate by word and deed God's real salvific will in a nutshell; here RMT correlates Law and Christology as he does throughout his gospel.<sup>86</sup>

There is nothing in this logion that allows us to conclude that behind Ἡλθον is implied "the ideal pre-existence of Christ."<sup>87</sup> However, it does look back at the totality of Jesus' accomplishment and legacy.<sup>88</sup> There are not grounds for seeing Jesus' messianic consciousness in this logion --all the more so if it was coined in the early Church. Nevertheless, that it has his messiahship in mind can be deduced especially from the addition of the μὴ νομίσητε clause.

### Conclusion.

We have seen that the present introduction to the Antitheses was formed out of four separate sayings. The logia v.17b. 18bc were probably already together in Q, possibly along with that of v.19 which served to nuance and soften v.18. The saying of v.20 is due to RMT, who is also responsible for the addition of "and the prophets" in v.17, for v.18d, and the association of observance and teaching of certain precepts to the Kingdom of heaven in v.19; RMT may also be responsible for the μὴ νομίσητε clause in v.17a.

Three moments in the tradition history of the logion of Mt.5,17 are discernible. (1) The oldest form of the program-

<sup>86</sup>Tödt, Son of Man 75; also Hoffmann, Logienquelle 178.

<sup>87</sup>View held by Hamerton-Kelly, Pre-Existence 76f, who explains: "If Christ is the fulfilment of scripture he must have been present -at least as an idea in the mind of God- when the plan of salvation to which the scriptures bear witness was formulated." This is eisegesis and not exegesis!

<sup>88</sup>This is evident from the redactional additions. Bultmann, ST 156 ("only serves to gather up the significance of the appearance of Jesus as a whole"), Hoffmann, op.cit. 177, and Dupont, Beatitudes I, 143, are of the same advise. To the contrary Jeremias, NTTh I, 83, and Montefiore, Gospels II, 47.

matic logion of v.17 is that of the simple οὐκ - ἀλλά statement, referring only to the OT Law. It was found to be most probably a saying coined by the early Church, where καταλῦσαι meant "to abrogate, derogate," and πληρῶσαι referred to a reconsideration of the Law in the light of the fundamental and all encompassing principle of love of neighbor. Here ἦλθον + inf. has the sense of an authoritative "my purpose is ...."

(2) When associated with the Antitheses, πληρῶσαι acquired the sense of "to complete, perfect" the Law, by bringing out the radicality of its exigency, viz. the inclusion --and primacy-- of the interior attitude which is appraised in the light of the principle of love. Now ἦλθον implies a God-given authority to deal thus with the Law, approaching ἀπεστάλην. (3) The final Mtan redactor, by adding "and the prophets" and the interpretative v.18d, extended the concept of πληρῶσαι to include Jesus' deeds as well as his teaching, giving πληρῶσαι a Christological orientation. Consequently ἦλθον implied the coming of the Messiah who fulfilled the prophecies and showed God's definite salvific will for men. Undoubtedly it looked back at the totality of Jesus' mission.

## CHAPTER TWO

### "THE SON OF MAN CAME" SAYINGS

#### I. COME TO SERVE: Mk.10,42-45/Mt.20,25-28/(Lk.22,25-27).<sup>1</sup>

The pericope which we are about to study is found in all three Synoptics. The Mkan and Mtan versions are practically identical. But, even though the Lkan text embodies most of the important components of the discourse found in Mt/Mk and has the same structural development, it shows considerable differences. This leads us to suspect that we are before the same discourse transmitted, interpreted, and adopted by two different traditions. The existence of different traditions may be postulated on the basis of context dissimilarity, the considerable verbal differences, and the climaxing logion.

#### A. Differing Contexts.

While Mt and Mk present the discourse about service as a means to true greatness in the greater context of the Zebedees' request for the highest rank in the Kingdom, Lk has it immediately after the Last Supper. It is evident that, if it is the same discourse, it was hardly pronounced on both occasions. One of these (or both?) is misplaced. This observation, and the fact that Lk did not preserve the discussion with the Zebedees, indicates that the pericope may have had an independent existence.<sup>2</sup> This initial suspicion receives further support from the difference in point of view expressed in the two pericopes that are found as one block in Mt/Mk: v.35-40 are concerned with rank in the Kingdom of heaven, v.42-44 with rank in the community. While v.35-40 show an eschatological per-

---

<sup>1</sup>Tons of paper and gallons of ink have been used to study this pericope, especially the final (ransom) saying. For this reason I desist giving a bibliography here. A partial bibliography can be gathered from the footnotes and the Bibliography itself.

<sup>2</sup>That is also the opinion of the majority of exegetes. Taylor, Mk 443, however, considers them to "follow well", and Feuillet, "La Coupe" 357, thinks that it is more likely than not that the connection is historical, even if v.41 is "editorial."

spective, v.42-44 have a this-world one. And, while v.35-40 contain no reproach to the Zebedees' request, v.42-44 do. The two pericopes are united via v.41-42a. In Lk the same discourse is also artificially tied to the Last Supper: suffice it to note the Lkan seam ἐγέγερτο δέ in v.24a, and the unexpected abrupt change of situation only to come back in v.28 to the lamentation made in v.22.

The absence of the Zebedees' episode in Lk cannot be satisfactorily explained as having been absent in his special source (L, or proto-Lk) once he departed from his Mkan source. In Lk the Mkan outline has been followed up to Mk.10,34 (Lk.18, 33) and then picked up again in 10,46 (Lk.18,35). This suggests that the omission of Mk.10,35-45 was intentional. It may have been made "in the interest of the disciples themselves."<sup>3</sup> A similar consideration may lie behind Lk.8,25/Mk.4,40 and in Lk's omission of Jesus' rebuke to Peter in Mk.8,32f/Mt.16,22f. However, another explanation is possible for this omission, viz. RLk's understanding of v.35-40 as an allusion to the martyrdom of the Zebedee brothers. Lk, who knew of James' martyrdom (cf. Acts 12,2), either knew or assumed John's non-martyr death since he was exiled in Patmos at old age, and considered this pericope to be questionable. It remains also possible to think that Lk left this episode out in order to avoid a doublet with his special source,<sup>4</sup> preferring that located at the Last Supper. In any event, Lk must have understood Mk.10,35-45 as a unity and as such left it out in c.18.

#### B. Literary Criticism.

We shall first study separately the Mt/Mk text and then that of Lk, aided by the source of Mt/Mk, because of their assumed different developments in tradition which the considerable verbal differences reveal.

<sup>3</sup>Cadbury, Style 95; similarly Feuillet, "Le Logion" 378, Büchsel, in TDNT IV, 342 n.17, and Boismard, Synopse 317.

<sup>4</sup>Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 93, rejects this view. To the contrary, it is upheld by Schelkle, Passion 135, T.W.Manson, Sayings 337, Feuillet, "Le Logion" 377, Schulz, Nachfolge 256 n.13, and Gaboury, Structure 56.



1. Mk. 10, 42-44/Mt. 20, 25-27.<sup>5</sup>

There is no doubt that v. 41-42a is a redactional transition which has been shaped by each final redactor<sup>6</sup> with the purpose of best linking two pericopes that treat a similar subject matter. The indication that Jesus προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοῦς said etc., in v. 42a, is to be considered as a redactional element tying what precedes with what follows and introducing the discourse of v. 42b-45 with the same formula we find in Mk. 3, 22 and 10, 23. That we are before a Mkan seam may be deduced from the added fact that the pronoun αὐτοῦς is ambiguous: does it refer to the Zebedee brothers, to the other ten, or to the twelve? The verb προσκαλεῖν is frequent in Mk.<sup>7</sup> It is also a known fact that Mt often changes the historical pte. in Mk to an aorist (and at times to an impft.):<sup>8</sup> here λέγει to εἶπεν. Mt often has δέ where Mk has καί. Likewise the pleonastic αὐτοῖς of Mk is absent in Mt, a frequent Mtan amelioration.<sup>9</sup> It can therefore be assumed that Mt depends on a Mkan text for the introduction of the discourse.

a. The synonymic parallelismus membrorum of v. 42bc is probably the best indication of what may have been the original form of this saying, since rhythmic parallelism is characteristic of oral transmission. We read:

<sup>5</sup>For the sake of simplicity, I shall use the versification of Mk, being understood that Mt's parallel is meant when referring to Mt without naming his own versification.

<sup>6</sup>Mt's περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν implies a dependence on the Mkan text; so also Taylor, Mk 443. The pleonastic ἄρχομαι, which is more frequent in Mk (27x) than in Mt (13x), the naming of individuals, the expression οἱ δέκα which resembles his frequent οἱ δώδεκα (3/10/6), are all Mkan traits.

<sup>7</sup>Found 9 times, only 6 times in Mt. In the part. aor. 7 times in Mk and 6 in Mt. The simple καλεῖν, in the sense of calling someone to come, is more frequent in Mt (10x) than in Mk (3x).

<sup>8</sup>Similar changes are to be found for instance in the par. to Mk. 2, 5. 8. 24. 25; 3, 22. 23. 33. 34; 4, 11; etc. It is rare to find Mk's εἶπεν as λέγει in Mt, and most of these cases are due to either theological or grammatical reasons. See Zerwick, Markus-Stil 67ff.

<sup>9</sup>See the Mtan par. to Mk. 1, 40. 41; 2, 8. 17. 18; 4, 2. 11; etc. In some cases Mt omits the dative pronoun in order to generalize. Jones, Mk 165, indicates that Mk's is a typical Semitic repetition, and Kuhn, Sammlungen 149, points out that καί + part. aor. + λέγει + dative of object is generally a pre-Mkan formula. Mk's is καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς (ibid. 158).

Mk. 10, 42

οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν  
κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν  
καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν  
κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν

Mt. 20, 25

οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν  
κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν  
καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι  
κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν

The differences between the two texts are evident. It is quite probable that the Mkan redactor changed his source's ἄρχοντες -- as we find in Mt-- to the ironic δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν<sup>10</sup> in order to point out that God is the ultimate and definite ruler.<sup>11</sup> Mt would have preserved the original form, which is parallel to μεγάλοι. In the first half of the 2d. member, what may seem a pleonastic αὐτῶν in Mk is absent in Mt. However, on the basis of the parallelism, αὐτῶν must refer to τῶν ἐθνῶν : while the rulers lord over the nations, it is the great ones (μεγάλοι) of the peoples who tyrannize (κατεξουσιάζουσιν) them. It is admittedly an ambiguous pronoun, for which reason it was probably Mt who omitted it. It is impossible to determine whether in the original form it also read τῶν ἐθνῶν as in v.42b, or αὐτῶν; for the sake of parallelism one of these most probably was present, and since Mk is not prone to remove ambiguities (see those in 2,15!), it may have been αὐτῶν that was in his source.<sup>12</sup>

The number of terms rarely used in the NT and the mentioned changes suggest that both, Mt and Mk, depend on a common source.

b. The sayings of v.43b-44 are verbally the same in both gospels, with the exception of two variations: the change in the syntactic order in v.43b and the alternation ὅμων - πάντων in v.44. This double saying apparently had at the origin a separate existence, unrelated to that of v.42.<sup>13</sup> This suspi-

<sup>10</sup>Taylor, Mk 443; Cranfield, Mk 340; Knox, Sources I, 121 n.1. See also 3 Mac.5,6.22; 4 Mac.13,14; Gal.2,2.6.9; 6,3.

<sup>11</sup>Thus also Lohmeyer, Mk 223. I cannot agree with Klostermann's statement, in Mk 108, that Mt left out δοκοῦντες showing an opposition to the earthly rulers. In both, Mt and Mk, there is an underlying negative evaluation of the manner in which those in authority rule, but not about the fact that they rule!

<sup>12</sup>Klostermann, Mk 108, also hesitates whether αὐτῶν refers to the ἄρχοντες, or to τῶν ἐθνῶν. For Allen, Mt 216, αὐτῶν is a Mkan addition.

<sup>13</sup>So also Schulz, Nachfolge 252 n.3; Bultmann, ST 87f, 143, 368; Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 69; Kuhn, Sammlungen 174.

cion becomes more serious once we take into account the fact that not only do we find them (though slightly varying) in other contexts as well (v.43b/Mt.23,11; v.44/Mk.9,35) but also, while v.42 focuses its attention on the manner in which those in authority exercise their power,<sup>14</sup> v.43b-44 are concerned with the question of ranks within the community.<sup>15</sup>

These verses are built in an almost perfect synonymic parallelism:

	<u>Mk.10,43b.44</u>		<u>Mt.20,26b.27</u>
v.43b.	ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,	a	ὃς ἔαν θέλῃ
		b	ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι,
v.44.	καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος	c	ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
		a'	καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ
		b'	ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος,
		c'	ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος

The position of the associative dative in v.43b differs, and very probably was in its pre-Mkan form as now found in Mt; RMk may have changed it in order to stress the communitarian dimension. It also must have been RMk who changed ὑμῶν for πάντων in the apodosis of v.44 in order to underline the "limitless" extent of service. To the ἐν ὑμῖν of v.44 would naturally correspond in a rhythmic parallelism another ὑμῶν, and not πάντων, as in v.43b.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, while Mt has preserved this double logic as he found it in his source, thus maintaining a perfect parallelism, RMk made some changes to it. It follows that, if our analysis is correct, the common source of Mt and Mk is other than one of these. On the basis of other analyses, it is pre-Mkan.

It may further be thought that the saying of v.43b and

<sup>14</sup>Against T.W.Manson, Teaching 313. The verb κατακυριεύειν has the sense of having dominion over someone or something, to one's advantage; see eg. Gen.1,28; 9,1.7; Jer.3,14; Acts 19,16; 1 Pt.5,3; etc. On the other hand, κατεξουσιάζειν is relatively rare, never being used in the LXX, by Josephus, nor by Philo, but is found in the Acts of Thomas 45, 98. It refers to the use of power in a tyrannous manner.

<sup>15</sup>This suggests that v.43b-44 was the original main answer to the Zebedees' request. Thus also Bultmann, ST 144, Schulz, Nachfolge 253 n.4, and Boismard, Synopse 317.

<sup>16</sup>If originally v.43b-44 was Jesus' answer to the Zebedees' request, then ὑμῶν, and not πάντων, must have been used. Note the same use of πάντων by Mk in 9,35 (2x!). According to Klostermann, Mt 163, Mt changed the original πάντων to ὑμῶν.

that of v.44 had different origins: this is suggested by the parallels these have elsewhere (see further p.129f).

The introductory words to the logia of v.43b-44 are redactional. This conclusion may be drawn from the (already indicated) difference in stress between the logion of v.42 and that of v.43b-44. It is certain that v.42-44 already constituted at the pre-Mkan stage a unity, as attested by the verbal agreement between Mt and Mk, not only of the logia themselves but also of the seam of v.43a, where Mk inserted the adversative  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  and changed  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  for  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$ .<sup>17</sup> The original is most probably Mt's  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ , where the future is used in Semitic fashion with imperatival force, as in v.43b.44 (cf. also Mk.9,35 and Mt.23,11!).  $\text{O}\acute{\upsilon}$  + future indicative, a legal (categorical) prohibition, is very frequent in the OT but most rare on Jesus' lips.<sup>18</sup> RMk would have changed it to the pte. in order to stress the perennial value of the community rule that follows.

c. The Logion of Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28. This logion is verbatim the same in both gospels except for the introductory connective.<sup>19</sup> Mk's  $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  is certainly more primitive than Mt's  $\omega\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ .<sup>20</sup> In fact,  $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  is used only twice in Mt and Mk (14,70), while  $\omega\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ , which is never used in Mk, is to be found ten times in Mt. In both the intention is to introduce the

<sup>17</sup>Mk's  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$  and Mt's  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  are very well attested. A,C, K,X, the Ferrar and Lake groups, it<sup>q</sup>, syr<sup>s</sup>, p,h,l,bo, goth, arm, geo, read instead  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  in Mk, and B,D, itd, sa, geo,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$  in Mt.

We may also point out the chiasmus established by v.42-44:

$\text{o}\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\theta\nu\acute{\omega}\nu \dots\dots \text{o}\acute{\iota} \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\iota$   
 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\varsigma \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \dots\dots \pi\epsilon\omega\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$

<sup>18</sup> $\Pi^{\iota}\Pi^{\iota}$  with Jussive force; it is Gnostic. See B1-D §362; Moulton, *NTGK* II, 458, and Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede* 76. For Plummer, Mt 279,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$  would have been the original and  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  a harmonization.

<sup>19</sup>Some MSS, viz. D, syr<sup>c</sup>, it, have added  $\text{u}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon} \zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon \epsilon\kappa \mu\iota\kappa\epsilon\upsilon \alpha\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \dots \kappa\tau\lambda$  (see a critical ed. of the NT) after Mt. 20,28b. A detailed study of this addition and its origin was made by H.J. Vogels, "Ein apokrypher Zusatz im Mt-Evangelium (20,28)," *BZ* 12(1914), 369-390. MS evidence is unquestionably against its originality. It is a weak reproduction of Lk.14,8f. For Resch, *Agrapha* 38, it is a "thatsächliche [sic] Fragment einer aussercanonischen Uebersetzung der hebräischen Quellschrift" and hence considers it as pre-canonical.

<sup>20</sup>syr<sup>s</sup>, it<sup>c</sup>, read  $\omega\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ , as in Mt, instead of  $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ .

example of the Son of Man, for which ὥστε is certainly a clearer and better particle.<sup>21</sup>

The original connective, Mk's καὶ γάρ, has an artificial tone and leads one to suspect that v.45 has been linked with the discourse on true greatness at some stage in tradition. That v.45 originally was unattached to v.42ff can be deduced from the fact that while v.42-44 are an ethical imperative, v.45 presents an a posteriori exemplary cause.<sup>22</sup> And, while v.43f probably constituted the original response to the Zebedees' request --concerned with greatness,-- v.45 is concerned only with humble service; not at all with greatness. We may also notice that v.45 is a saying about Jesus' mission (ἡλθεν), independent of the disciples' attitude, capable of an independent existence, while v.42-44 concentrate on the manner of becoming great in God's eyes. Since, as we have seen, Mt has been relying on a pre-Mkan text, the linkage of v.45 with v.42-44 must also go back at the latest to that moment in tradition. The connective in v.45a is not a Mkan seam!<sup>23</sup>

Not only was v.45 originally not tied to v.42-44, but also the logion of v.45 was constituted by the union of two independent logia, viz. v.45a and v.45b.<sup>24</sup> The fact that Mt, who had pre-Mk as his source, has both sayings indicates that at the pre-Mkan stage of tradition these were already together,<sup>25</sup> probably at the artifice of pre-Mk himself (cf. p.130f).

In the same manner as the logia of v.45a and v.45b have been linked because of a common idea, viz. Jesus' exemplary service, so also v.45a has been probably attracted to the present context by the thematic hookword διακον-.<sup>26</sup> And, as v.45a

<sup>21</sup>Mk's καὶ γάρ implies that here the basis for that on which the exhortation of v.43f rests is given. It is causal, while Mt's ὥστε is comparative.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Schulz, Nachfolge 303f and Schweizer, Mk 126.

<sup>23</sup>See Knox, Sources I, 72; Higgins, Jesus 39; Schulz, op. cit. 264; Kuhn, Sammlungen 155; Roloff, "Anfänge" 51f.

<sup>24</sup>That is also the opinion of most exegetes. To the contrary, Jones, Mk 166, and is implied by Feuillet, "La Coupe" 371.

<sup>25</sup>Thus also Tödt, SM 206f and Roloff, art.cit. 51.

<sup>26</sup>Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 69; Tödt, SM 209; Schulz, op. cit. 257. V.45a did not develop out of v.45b: the former is parenetic and suggests a meal framework, the latter is kerygmatic and falls back on Isa.53. It can also be affirmed that the contrary did not take place either, i.e. that v.45b ///

attracted v.45b, so v.43f attracted the former.

d. History of the Formation of Mk.10,42-45: its transmission and composition may be pictured thus, on the basis of our foregoing considerations. Originally a series of separate and independent logia existed in the early Church's tradition, viz. v.42bc.43b.44.45a.45b. At first v.43b-44 (or only v.44?)<sup>27</sup> constituted (part of?) the answer to the Zebedees' request. Then v.42 was attached to it as an introduction and linked with what preceded it; v.45a was also added at this time. Finally, v.45b was added by pre-Mk as the supreme example of true greatness and service. All of these logia already constituted a unity in pre-Mk.

It is extremely difficult to go back beyond pre-Mk in order to find the possible tradition he might have known. The sayings themselves show no tensions nor major anachronisms that would allow us to determine redactional additions or changes to a still older form. The terminology employed suggests a composition in a Greek-speaking milieu. However, it may be suspected that originally the pronouns in v.43-44 were all absent since ὑμῶν refers to a formed group and, in most of the occasions wherein it is used, there is a community preoccupation.<sup>28</sup> This may explain the facility with which RMk changed the position of ἐν ὑμῖν in v.43b, and from ὑμῶν passed to πάντων in v.44. Finally, the expression "Son of Man" in v.45a may well be due to pre-Mk: Lk shows a use of the first person! (cf. p.135). A more detailed study of the saying of v.45 will be carried out in §D.

Graphically, the development of our text looks thus:

---

/// developed out of v.45a. As will be clarified, v.45b had a separate existence. For a similar view cf. Roloff, "Anfänge" 51f.

<sup>27</sup>If any, it would seem that it was the logion of v.44 that was part of, if not the actual answer given to the Zebedees' request: it speaks of places (πεῶτος). If this is so, was it then moved away from its original position by the introduction of v.38-43, conflating the response of Jesus? See Kuhn, Sammlungen 174.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Bultmann, ST 144, 148, and after him Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 69. Gaechter, Mt 650, calls ἐν ὑμῖν "ein pedantischer Zusatz"!

- v.42b. Οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν / ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν  
κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν  
c. καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν / (τῶν ἐθνῶν ?)  
κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.
- v.43a. οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔστιν / ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν ἀλλ'  
b. ὃς (ἐ)ὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν,  
ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος,
- v.44. καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος,  
ἔσται ὑμῶν / πάντων δοῦλος.
- v.45a. καὶ γὰρ / ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι  
b. καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρου ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

Key: ——— pre-Mkan addition or change; ----- Mkan change;  
———— Mkan addition or change.

## 2. The Lukan Text.

a. Comparison with Pre-Mk. Placing the text of pre-Mk next to that of Lk one observes that, on the one hand, both present the same general structure:

Mk.10,42/Lk.22,25: the way political authorities exert their power: οἱ ... καὶ οἱ ...;

Mk.10,43f/Lk.22,26: two sayings on the path to follow in order to become truly "great";

Mk.10,45a/Lk.22,27b: a logion on Jesus' exemplary humble behavior.

The identity in structure indicates that either Lk had pre-Mk as a source, or Lk's own source (L) had pre-Mk (or its source) at its basis. Given that, on the other hand, there are many important differences, not only of context but especially of vocabulary where several important terms occur only here, and others found in pre-Mk are surprisingly enough absent in Lk,<sup>29</sup>

<sup>29</sup>Some of the terms used are found in both versions (Lk and Mt/Mk): τῶν ἐθνῶν, (κατα)κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, (κατα)εξουσιάζουσιν / οντες αὐτῶν, διακονῶν/ος. Others can be explained as Lkan adaptations to a well established community situation: οἱ βασιλεῖς corresponds to οἱ ἄρχοντες, ὁ μείζων το μέγας, ὁ νεώτερος το διάκονος, ὁ ἡγούμενος το πρῶτος, ὁ διακονῶν το δοῦλος, and διακονῆσαι το ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. For the study of the vocabulary used in Mk and Lk see esp. Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 63-99. Vocabulary used in pre-Mk which could be taken to be Lkan but is absent in Lk includes the composites with κατά in v.42bc (composites///

we can conclude that while pre-Mk (or its source) was an indirect source of Lk, it was proto-Lk (L) that was his direct source. This was a written source because there remain linguistic contacts with Mt/Mk which cannot be otherwise explained, and the same structural development. Thus, the transmission of this discourse had followed different paths. The difference in perspectives and interests which dictate the vocabulary to be employed are witnesses to this fact.<sup>30</sup>

b. Lk.22,25-26. The number of classical Gk expressions (φιλο-νείκία, εὐεργέτης, κυριεύειν, ἐξουσιάζειν) which do not recur in Lk/Acts, as well as the use of expressions not proper to Lk (ὁ μείζων(?), ἀνάκειμαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι + object) indicate that the complex v.24-27 is not a Lkan creation but refers back to a special written source. Technical terms such as ὁ ἡγούμενος and ὁ διακονῶν<sup>31</sup> point to an ecclesial concern with those in authority and a consequent adaptation of his source.

The following expressions can be safely considered to come from the pen of RLk: ἐγένετο δέ (cf. 3,21; 6,1.6a.12; 8,22; etc.), δὲ καί (10 times) and τό' introducing an indirect question (cf. 2,18; 5,14; 6,36; 9,6; etc.), all in v.24. This indicates that the original introduction has been reworked by Lk.<sup>32</sup> It is noteworthy that v.24 has the air of repeating 9,46: εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν. It may be a conflation of a longer introduction, like that in Mk.9,33ff.<sup>33</sup>

In v.25 the aor. εἶπεν (181/80/297) and καλεῖν in the sense of "to be called/named" (16/1/30) are probably Lkan.

In v.26 the semitizing use of γίνομαι instead of εἶναι<sup>34</sup> may be Lkan. The terms νεώτερος, ὁ ἡγούμενος, and ὁ διακονῶν

/// according to Hawkins, HS 142, occur 245/238/425+447 times) ἄρχοντες, ὃς ἂν, πρεσβυτερός.

<sup>30</sup>Lk's motivation is wholly ethical: to the leaders of his communities, on the correct use of authority; Mk's and Mt's intention is primarily kerygmatic.

<sup>31</sup>The substantivizing of participles is a Lkan trait which Cadbury, Style 135f, has pointed out.

<sup>32</sup>Cf. the detailed analysis of Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 65f.

<sup>33</sup>Thus also T.W. Manson, Sayings 338.

<sup>34</sup>Cf the par. to Lk.6,36.49; 11,30; 17,26; 19,17; 20,14.33 or the Lkan par. to Mt.7,27; 12,40; 25,51 and to Mk.12,7.23. See further Cadbury, Style 179. γινώσκω, a future in lieu of an imperative, is a Semitism, cf. Moulton, NTGk II, 458.



are Lkan substantivations of participles.<sup>35</sup> It is not excluded that RLk used the participial form ὁ διακονῶν of a more primitive δίακονος, to rhyme with the parallel v.26a.<sup>36</sup> It is very likely that v.26b is a Lkan creation, because of the technical ministerial terminology used (ὁ ἡγούμενος, Acts 15, 22; Hebr.13,7.17.24; and ὁ διακονῶν, Acts 6,1f; 19,22). They substituted at some point those still found in Mt/Mk v.44: πρῶτος for ἡγούμενος and δοῦλος for διακονῶν.

c. The Logion of v.27. Only the use of οὐχί instead of the simpler οὐκ (9/0/18), ἐγὼ δέ, which aside of Mt.5 is found only in Lk/Acts,<sup>37</sup> and the participial form διακονῶν (cf. v. 26b), are possibly due to the pen of RLk.

d. History of the Literary Formation of the Lukan Discourse.

It is probable that the logion of v.26a be an adaptation (altering one like Mk.10,43) made already in Lk's source influenced by that of 9,48c (ὁ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός ἐστιν μέγας).<sup>38</sup> To this v.26b was later added by RLk, replacing a logion like that found in Mk.10,44, so as to provide a direct application of v.26a to the situation in his community/ies.<sup>39</sup> The conj. καί, linking v.26a.b, would then be epexegetic: the μείζων, i.e. the ἡγούμενος among you, should be as the νεώτερος, i.e. as the ones διακονῶν among you. Since v.25 can hardly have existed isolated, and v.26b is very probably due to Lk, then v.25 and v.26a had reached Lk as a unity.

<sup>35</sup>Cadbury, Style 135f. νέος 2/2/6, the comparative νεώτερος occurring 0/0/3+1 times. ἡγούμενος is never found in Mk, only in Mt.2,6 and Acts 7,10; 14,12; 15,22. ὁ διακονῶν occurs again in v.27 and in Acts 19,22. Lk never uses the substantive δίακονος (3/2/0) while the part. form is absent in Mk and Mt.

<sup>36</sup>Thus also Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 78, 95.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. 15,17; 22,32, as well as Acts 22,8.28; 25,25; 26,15. The adversative δέ is very often used by Lk, cf. Hawkins, HS 121.

<sup>38</sup>The absence of εἶναι for the more Lkan γίνεσθαι, in Semitic fashion, may be an indication of an earlier stage of composition. We find οὕτως + εἶναι in 11,30; 15,7; 17,24.26, and οὕτως + γίνεσθαι in Lk.10,21; 12,54; 15,10. Cf. Bl-D §480(5), and Schürmann, op.cit. 73. For Knox, Sources I, 122, v.26a is "a Lucan insertion".

<sup>39</sup>Black, in Aramaic 222, on the basis of a retroversion to the Aram. concludes that the two versions, Mt/Mk and Lk, go back to a common source. Thus μέγας = μείζων = נָר, πρῶτος = ἡγούμενος = שִׁיר, δοῦλος = διακονῶν = נָזִיז, δίακονος = νεώτερος = נָזִיז.

The double question in v.27 is not at all Lk's formulation, but is Semitic.<sup>40</sup> The absence of the auxiliary εἶναί may also be indicative of an origin other than Lk. The fact that v.27 is the actual response to the problem about who is greater and forms an inclusio with v.24 (μεῖζων), and furthermore, that v.25f are concerned with those actually in authority and the manner they are to exert it, while v.27 comes back to the question of who is greater, are indications that v.27 originally was unrelated to v.25f.<sup>41</sup> It may well have been an adaptation made by pre-Lk of his source.

The response-reaction to the rhetorical 2d. question by its dialectic contrary, pointing to Jesus' example, seems to have originated from a Hellenistic milieu (analogous to the diatribe!). It may thus be posterior to v.27a which, in its double question, reveals a Semitic mode of expression. However this is conjectural, for one could doubt that no applicative-answer would follow v.27a --otherwise one would be left with the impression that superiority was being advised.

Summarizing. The earliest stage of the Lkan tradition had the same structure as we possess today, but was worded differently. V.27a may have been absent. Lk's source probably changed v.25. RLk synthetized v.24 and changed v.26b to serve as an application for his community/ies.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup>See the Lkan par. to Mk.2,18; 4,21.38; 5,35.39; 6,37; 8,16; 11,17; 12,15.24.26; 15,12; 16,3 where the question(s) have been "flattened" to a simple sentence. Cf. also Billerbeck II, 257. Jeremias, NTTh I, 293, points out that there is a play on words in the Aram. behind μεῖζων/ἀνακεῖμενος: rabba/ra-be'a.

<sup>41</sup>Since the same structure was already found in pre-Mk, this means that a logion like that of Mk.10,45 or Lk.22,27b was known by both. The wording was later changed. If separate existence of this logion is postulated it is not in the sense that it existed from its origin in two different sources: it is the same logion that was adapted by two different traditions. It would be too coincidental that both pre-final redactors would have independently found an analogous logion and placed it in the same position!

<sup>42</sup>Bultmann, ST 276, is certainly right when he affirms that v.24-30 are a complex of dominical sayings. T.W. Manson, Sayings 338, and Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 99, had already pointed out that these sayings constituted already a unity when they reached Lk, but in their present form --which excludes the final redactor's activity. Higgins, Jesus 37, is of the opinion that Lk, or his source, created v.27 so as to fit the setting of the Last Supper.

### C. Form and Formative Factors.

#### 1. The Discourse in Mt/Mk.

a. The Question of Greatness: v.43-44. The series of logia that constitute the discourse under study definitely served a parenetic purpose: v.43f are an instruction, in halakic form, on the manner of exercising authority for those holding authoritative positions within a community. The first and final verses strengthen this instruction: v.42 is the statement of the evidence found in political rulers,<sup>43</sup> and v.45 points to the example given by Jesus. The parenetic intention that led to the composition of this discourse is all the more evident when one observes the general context in which the sayings have been placed. Mt.18,1-19,15 is totally concerned with instructions for the early Church, part of which we find in Mk.9,33-10,16. Following this section we find a sequence of a paradigmatic example followed by a consequent instruction (setting aside the third Passion prediction<sup>44</sup>); the most noticeable are: Mk.10,17-22/Mt.19,16-22: the rich young man ..... paradigm. eg. 23-31/ 23-30: on riches and reward ... parenesis Mk.10,35-40/Mt.20,20-23: the Zebedees' request .. paradigm. eg. 42b-45/ 25b-28: on using authority ..... parenesis. The greater ensemble, v.35-45, constitutes, as in the preceding ones, a paradigm for teaching purposes.

The saying of v.43b has a parallel in Mt.23,11 (ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος), where there is also a teaching about true greatness (v.1-12). That the saying of v.43b is older than Mt. 23,11 can be deduced from the fact that the latter is found in a discourse addressed to the Church leaders (ὁ μείζων), and the pronouns which are dependent on the context cannot be removed.<sup>45</sup> Mt has probably reused and adapted in 23,11 the logion of 20,26.

<sup>43</sup>The whole is constructed in parabolic fashion: on the basis of the observation of concrete reality (v.42) a lesson is drawn (v.43f). See also Mt.6,32ff; 12,33ff; 24,32ff; 26,2 and parallels, besides the parables themselves.

<sup>44</sup>Mt.20,17-19/Mk.10,32-34 and the parable of the workers of the vineyard (20,1-16) which constitute in Mt the example for the prediction of the Passion that follows it.

<sup>45</sup>See Boismard, *Synopse* 355. The superlative use of μείζων is not found in Mk but occurs twice in Mt (18,4; 23,11). As a comparative it is used 7x in Mt and 3 in Mk. Note also that διάκονος is used, with the exception of Mt.22,13, only in the logia about service (Mt.20,26; 23,11; Mk.9,35; 10,43).

The saying of v.44 has a parallel in Mk.9,35b where, to a dispute about priority, a lesson on service follows: εἰ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι ἔσται πάντων ἑσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος. This logion seems to have been used by pre-Mk in lieu of the saying we read in Mt.18,4/Lk.9,48c.<sup>46</sup> At first sight it would seem that Mk.9,35 is a conflation of 10,43b.44 with ἑσχατος corresponding to δοῦλος and with διάκονος serving as an explicative expansion of ἑσχατος. However, in 9,35 there are no personal pronouns, which suggests that originally 10,43b.44 did not have them either.<sup>47</sup> In Mk.9,35, as in 10,44, πάντων is most probably due to RMk. The existence of these parallels suggests furthermore that the sayings of v.43b and v.44 may either have had separate (independent?) existences or may have come from separate sources.<sup>48</sup>

b. The Logia of Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28. A number of observations indicate that v.45a and v.45b did not always exist together. Thus, v.45a is an οὐκ-ἀλλά construction and, as other such constructions, it is a unitary simple saying where, in Semitic fashion, what is first said negatively serves only to underline what then is added positively (see Mt.5,17b; 9,13b; 10,34b par.). While the presentation of v.45a is ethico-parenetic, that of v.45b is catechetico-kerygmatic; and while Jesus' life of service is an aspect that may be imitated, his redemptive death is not.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, while v.45a hinges on the concept of true greatness, v.45b hinges on Jesus' redemptive death, i.e. v.45b applies to Jesus what was laid down as a principle in v.43f

<sup>46</sup>Lk's version is older. See the analysis made by Boismard, Synopse 263f.

<sup>47</sup>Similarly Bultmann, ST 87f.

<sup>48</sup>Thus also Haenchen, Weg 368; see also Nineham, Mk 280. It is noteworthy that, when compared with the logion of v.42, in v.43b-44 we do not have an equally perfect parallelism: note the position of ἐν ὑμῖν and the verbal difference from γίνεσθαι in v.43b to εἶναι in v.44 in spite of the fact that the other verbs are the same in both members of the parallelism. Furthermore, outwardly both say the same thing but envisage different aspects of humility. One may therefore wonder whether v.44 actually prepared the way for the introduction of v.45b as v.43b did for v.45a.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Tödt, SM 207 and Kuhn, Sammlungen 152 who rightly remarked that "the disciples cannot be summoned to give their lives as a ransom for many, or all." (Tödt). See also Schulz, Nachfolge 265. For Feuillet, "Le Logion" 371, v.45a.b are Jesus' example and the disciple is to follow the master and continue his work, which means that v.45a.b were a unity.

and as an example of life in v.45a. The conj. καί in v.45b is therefore exegetical.<sup>50</sup> We pass from the idea of service to that of ransom.

The two logia which constitute Mk.10,45 par. are of a different form. V.45a belongs to the group of sayings about the SM's activity on earth, as Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f and Mt.18,11/Lk.19,10 (q.v.). V.45b is to be classed among the Passion predictions.<sup>51</sup> The λύτρον-saying is a sort of credal formula of the type of 1 Cor.15,3, i.e. it is a theologumenon used for a kerygmatic purpose. It is noteworthy that Jesus' death serves a parenetic purpose only in late texts (1 Tim.6,13f; 1 Pt.2, 20f; 4,1ff.13), and is not found thus used in the Pauline writings. These two logia tie Christology and Soteriology thru the underlying conception of Jesus as the Servant of God.<sup>52</sup>

c. The Formative "Setting in Life" (Sitz im Leben). The pre-Mkan "setting in life" is to be sought in a community that is already fairly well organized. The terms referring to ministerial charges point in this direction, as well as the added ἐν ὕμῳ. A Judeo-Christian milieu is deducible from these functional terms (which contrast with the Lkan more Hellenistic ones), as well as from the use of the MT instead of the LXX of Isa.53 for the interpretation of Jesus' death in v.45b (§ D.1).

The original "setting in life" of the complex v.42-44 is probably to be found no further back than the period of organization of the early Church.<sup>53</sup> It was during this period that Christianity began to be a noticeable phenomenon to the secular authorities and felt itself underestimated by them, as the com-

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Lohse, Martyrer 118; Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 261; Schulz, Nachfolge 257, and Feuillet, "Le Logion" 373.

<sup>51</sup>Δοῦναι, inf. aor., has a pregnant futuristic sense; cf. Zerwick, Greek §252. There is nevertheless a fundamental difference between v.45b and the Passion predictions: while the former is a self-giving (δοῦναι-αὐτοῦ), the latter speak of a handing over (παρεδοῦναι).

<sup>52</sup>The intimate connection between these two dimensions (Christological and Soteriological) is formally welded by having placed "Son of Man" as the common subject of both logia.

<sup>53</sup>Cf. Schweizer, Mk 126, Jones, Mk 165, Bultmann, ST 146f. It is difficult to determine whether the stringing of these logia responds to a situation of power strifes within the community (Haenchen, Weg 367) or even if it was meant to counteract a certain authoritarianism (Bonnard, Mt 297).

parison with the ἄρχοντες and μεγάλοι suggests. This however does not necessarily mean that the individual sayings were all shaped in the same environment.

The final "setting in life", which may have been the reason for the linkage of the pericope of the Zebedees and the instruction on true greatness (thus forming a paradigm-discourse), was probably the existing rivalries between those in authority (be it an authority within the community or in society). Indicative is the observation made in v.41: and the ten began ἀγανακτεῖν against the Zebedees.

d. The Determining Environment of the Logia of Mk.10,45 par.

It is doubtful that the original setting where the logion of v.45a was formed was a meal situation, as some scholars uphold on the basis of the verb διακονεῖν and the Lkan parallel. The verb διακονεῖν, which here has no object attached to it, has the generic sense of "to serve, minister;" understood this way it was placed in a context where the use of authority is the main preoccupation. We must nevertheless reckon with the fact that διακονεῖν frequently has the pregnant sense of waiting at table,<sup>54</sup> and was thus understood in the Lkan tradition.<sup>55</sup> However, we should not press this question too much since διακονεῖν is probably used metaphorically.

As we shall later see in greater detail, v.45b is an interpretation of Jesus' death on the basis of Isa.53 (MT) and on the understanding of a just-martyr's death, which is proper

<sup>54</sup>Cf. H.W. Beyer, art. διακονέω, TDNT II, 81-86.

<sup>55</sup>The Last Supper as original "setting in life" (Feuillet, "Le Logion" 378, Higgins, Jesus 49) is to be excluded. Lk.24, 24-27 is artificially linked to the Last Supper, as we already indicated: it has no relation to the immediately preceding reference to the betrayal; ἐγένετο δέ is a well known Lkan seam; one may also wonder what kind of greatness they argued about and what occasioned it. It is most probably v.27 that led Lk to place this complex near the Last Supper (Schulz, Nachfolge 264 n.27). If it originally had been part of the tradition about the Last Supper, why would it have been removed from there by pre-Mk? See further the observations of Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 82f, 88, 94f.

For Roloff, "Anfänge" 50, the "setting in life" of the redemption-texts is to be found esp. in the Eucharistic celebration; similarly Tödt, SM 210. Even though this is plausible in the light of Mk.14,24b, it is still to be shown that it must have been so. For Schulz, op.cit. 258, v.45 has its origin in Jesus' own messianic consciousness --an ascertation easy to make but most difficult to demonstrate or defend.

to Judaism. This suggests a Judeo-Christian origin of v.45b.<sup>56</sup> For some exegetes it is the term "Son of Man",<sup>57</sup> while for others it is the use of the MT of Isa.53 that reveals a Palestinian "setting in life".<sup>58</sup> Yet, one must reckon with the fact that the term *λύτρον* poses a problem of origins all of its own. In fact, the *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* by the life of one is a conception that finds no equivalent in Judaism. The other uses of the root *λύτρε-* either do not connote a substitution/equivalence or are definitely Hellenistic usages --see further p.150f. It is possible to think that the original milieu in which v.45b was formed was Palestinian, and later was modified in a Greek-speaking Judeo-Christian community to include *ἀντί* and *λύτρον*.<sup>59</sup> The logion of v.45b unquestionably constitutes a theological reflection on the meaning of Jesus' ignominious death. Finally, one may wonder whether the presentation of Jesus' death in Mt/Mk as an example does not correspond to a period of persecution, in which the idea of martyrdom was coming to the fore.

## 2. The Lukan Version.

a. The Form and Purpose of the Lukan Discourse. In the Lukan version of the discourse found in Mt/Mk several formal differences from the latter are discernable. The overall tone is more than that of a simple instruction: it is an ethical exigency for those in a position of authority in a community. The sayings of v.26 are formulated as categorical imperatives: *γινέσθω* (Lk's!). They are community rules.

b. The Climaxing Logion: v.27. The double rhetorical question and the affirmation that follows constitute a dialectic couplet;

<sup>56</sup>This is recognized by most scholars but denied by Bultmann, *ST* 144, Klostermann, *Mk* 109, and Barrett, "A Ransom" 21, who think rather of a Hellenistic origin.

<sup>57</sup>Lohse, *Martyrer* 117; Schulz, *Nachfolge* 257; Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 261 and *NTTh* I, 293.

<sup>58</sup>Thus Tödt, *SM* 210; Best, *Temptation* 141; Feuillet, "Le Logion" 387; Roloff, "Anfänge" 51, as well as Lohse, *op.cit.* 117 and Jeremias, *art.cit.* 261f.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. Schweizer, *Mk* 125, and Kuhn, *Sammlungen* 190. It can be argued that the *λύτρον*-concept was known among people who spoke Gk, even in Palestine. The centuries of Hellenistic influence in that part of the world is not to be ignored.

the former, formulated in impersonal terms, serves to make the self-witness of the latter more impressive by their being logical contraries. The logion of v.27b, though not an ἡλθεν-saying as in Mt/Mk, formulates a self-witness (ἐγώ - εἰμί) of an example being given and intended for imitation.

c. The Formative "Setting in Life". The organization of several sayings into one discourse, having one predominant topic, had been done with a parenetic purpose in a Judeo-Christian milieu (cf. supra, 131). RLk intensified it by giving an imperatival tone to the sayings of v.26, and directed it particularly to the ἡγούμενος, i.e. to those actually in authority within a community.<sup>60</sup> These details presuppose an organized group of communities wherein their leaders became overly impressed with their authority. The fact that this discourse was placed in the frame of the Last Supper, and that it used the image of table-service (v.27), does not necessarily mean that it had the Eucharistic celebrations in mind. The context and figure employed are meant to give maximal weight to the exhortation to humble service.

The adaptations and changes made by pre-Lk to his source, such as ἀρχοντες for βασιλεῖς and the addition of εὐεργέται καλοῦνται, suggest a universalistic outlook, such as would be proper to a movement expanded in the Hellenistic world where these realities were well known.

As in Mt/Mk, the final shaping of the instruction given in v.25f seems to have been the result of jealousies among those who were in authority within the community/ies. Most instructive is the introduction in v.24: "φιλονεικία began among them (ἐν αὐτοῖς) about who might be greater". The logion of v.27, which was formulated in terms of table service so as to illustrate through this picture the lesson intended to be taught, presupposes a strong sense of community which is lived especially in table-fellowship. Whether the actual origin of this saying took place within the frame of a Eucharistic celebration is another question --and needs not to detain us.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup>On the role and position of the community leaders see A. Lemaire, Les Ministères aux Origines de l'Eglise, Paris 1971, and F. Büchsel, art. ἡγεῖσθαι κτλ., TDNT II, 907f.

<sup>61</sup>See n.55 above, and our observations in p.132f.



D. The Logia of Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28 and Lk.22,27.

In this section we shall endeavor to find the oldest form of the logia under study. By comparing them with other related logia this will be further precised.

1. The Logia of Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28.

We have already seen that Mk.10,45 is a composition of two originally separated logia, v.45a and v.45b; the latter was appended to v.45a by pre-Mk.

a. The Title "Son of Man". The use of "Son of Man" in titular fashion, as is the case here, can hardly go back to Jesus; it is due either to pre-Mk or to its source. In Dan.7,14.27 and 1 En.46,3-6; 48,5; 62,8 the SM is an authoritative figure who is served and not who serves! This indicates that originally SM was certainly not the subject of v.45a. However, the predictions of the Passion are spoken in terms of the SM, which indicates (1) that it comes from a Church interpretation of the role Jesus, the SM, has played as the Suffering Servant;<sup>62</sup> "Son of Man" takes the place of "Jesus" and not "a man",<sup>63</sup> and (2) that SM was the subject only of the *λύτρον*-saying --an added indication of the separate origins of v.45a and v.45b. Jesus' reference to himself as the SM who serves would hardly have been understood in any other way than a contradiction in terms. Jeremias' study on the uses of the term "Son of Man" has convincingly shown that there was a tendency to introduce this term, often substituting an older first person.<sup>64</sup> It can therefore be presumed that in its origin v.45a was formulated in the first person, as Lk.22,27.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>62</sup>The link between the SM and the Suffering Servant may have been already present in the titles "The Chosen One," "The Just One" in 1 En. Cf. Lohse, *Märtyrer* 120 n.6.

<sup>63</sup>Versus Gaechter, *Mt* 650.

<sup>64</sup>"Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," *ZNW* 58 (1967), 159-172, esp. 166.

<sup>65</sup>That the first person, and not SM, is more primitive receives further support from expressions such as *σὺ μὲν μου*, *αὐτὸς μου*, and others; compare Lk.6,22 with 9,26/Mt.5,11; Mk. 8,38b with Mt.10,33b; Lk.12,8b with Mt.10,32b. Tödt, *SM* 208, is of the opinion that "Son of Man" was introduced before v.45b because it is still coherent with the pericope. C. Colpe, art. *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, *TDNT* VIII, 455, assumes that v.45a was a SM logion from the beginning. Cf. also Hahn, *Hoheitstitel* 57.

b. "A ransom for many". In contrast to v.45a,<sup>66</sup> the logion of v.45b is quite Semitic in tone and echoes Isa.53. Since the vocabulary of this logion has often been studied in detail,<sup>67</sup> I shall limit myself to some succinct observations.

(i) Δοῦναι is equivalent to נתן, verb which is frequently used when a sacrificial offering is mentioned. Also נשׁל is used in this connection, but less frequently.<sup>68</sup>

(ii) Ψυχή, in the sense of one's life, corresponds to the Hebr./Aram. נפשׁ. Better Greek is (ἐ)αυτόν (cf. 1 Mac.6,44; Lk.9,24; Mt.12,18; Acts 2,27; Hebr.10,38; 1 Tim.2,6; Tit.2,14).

(iii) The expression δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ is equivalent to the Hebr. לנפשו נתן and the Aram. נפשו נתן (as in the Tg to Isa.53,10).<sup>69</sup> It corresponds loosely to Isa.53,10a: נפשו ישיט, which literally would have to be translated by the Johannine expression τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν.<sup>70</sup> Ψυχὴν δοῦναι is common in Gk and

<sup>66</sup>SM= נפשׁו נתן and ἤλθεν = ἔλθω but, as we shall see, they have been introduced later. It is noteworthy that διακονεῖν is not found in the LXX. According to J.A. Emerton, "The Aramaic background of Mark x.45," JTS 11(1960), 334f, and Higgins, Jesus 48, the passive διακονηθῆναι cannot be translated into Aramaic, given that the Ithpe'el of עבר means "to be made, done, to become". However, we do find נפשׁו, in Aramaic, used in this passive sense: cf. bBer.52b! See further n.103, *infra*.

<sup>67</sup>See esp. the studies of Jeremias, "Lösegeld" esp. p.260, Lohse, Martyrer 118-120, Feuillet, "Le Logion" 374f, 379-384, and Barrett, "Background" 2-10.

<sup>68</sup>Δίδωμι, used in connection with σῶμα is found in Dan.7, 11; with ψυχὴ in Ex.21,23; 1 Mac.2,50; 4 Mac.13,13; with ἐαυτόν in 1 Mac.6,44. נשׁל is used as equivalent to נתן in Ex.4,11. 15,21; 8,23 (19 MT); 17,14; 21,13; Jos.24,7.25; 1 Sam.22,15; etc. Barrett, *art.cit.* 5, argues on the basis of the verb נרע which in the Hifil, in Isa.53,12 (and only here!) means "to uncover, lay naked." However, it seems to me that Isa.53,10 is closer than 53,12 to Mk.10,45b; cf. Hahn, Hoheitstitel 58.

<sup>69</sup>Isa.53,12b reads נפשו נרע, which corresponds to the ἐαυτόν ἐκέλευσεν of Phil.2,7 and resembles the αἶμα ἐκχυνόμενον of Lk.22,20b. Rabbinic texts witnessing to the use of this expression will be found in Schlatter, Mt 602 (Tos.Berak.7,7; Sifre Deut. 306; Mek.Ex. to 15,20 and to 21,1). The reflexive is never used in the OT.

<sup>70</sup>Cf. Jn.10,11.15.17.18; 13,37.38; 15,13; 1 Jn.3,16. The LXX and the Tg have changed the sense considerably. The LXX addresses it to the people in exile: ἐάν δώτε περίσματος, ἢ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν (B,V: ἡμῶν) ὁψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον; the ψυχὴ is no longer the subject of δῶτε/נשׁל. Jeremias, NTTh I, 292, points out that ψυχὴ=αἶμα in a Semitic mind [נפשׁ=נרע], and hence there would be an explicit connection between our logion and the words over the cup (cf. *infra*). Barrett approaches it to Isa. 53,12 (LXX!).

hence may be a Hellenization of a possible Semitic expression. (iv) Λύτρον means, in non-biblical literature, the price paid for the ransom of a war prisoner or of a slave. It is also used cultually to refer to what is paid to a deity by way of gratitude. It also means compensation, expiation. In the LXX it is used in the same sense as in profane literature, but cultural references are more frequent.<sup>71</sup> Since it refers to what is paid by way of compensation or indemnification, λύτρον is most often used in the plural.<sup>72</sup> In the LXX it is never used to refer to a guilt offering, but always to mean the price paid to satisfy the one who has the right to demand a satisfaction. Hence it is a legal term.<sup>73</sup>

The discussion on the precise sense of λύτρον in Mk.10,45 invariably leads one to consider its relation to ΠΩΝ in Isa. 53,10a. The substantive ΠΩΝ means an offense, guilt (cf. Gn. 26,10; Ps.68,22; Prov.14,9; Jer.51,5); in a cultural context it means "an expiatory offering" (cf. Lev.5,6; 6,10; 7,14; 19,21.22; Num.6,12; 18,9; Ezek.40,39; 42,13; 44,29; 46,20).<sup>74</sup> In Isa.53,10 ΠΩΝ has the cultic sense of a sacrifice having redemptive value.<sup>75</sup> It is to be noted however that nowhere is

<sup>71</sup>Concerning the various uses of λύτρον, see Büchsel, in TDNT IV, esp. 340. Words other than λύτρον, meaning a ransom or compensation paid and found in the LXX include ἀλλάγμα, ἀντ-ἀλλάγμα (cf. Mk.8,37; Mt.16,26), ἀντίλυτρον (cf. 1 Tim.2,6), ἀντίψυχον, ἐξίλασμα, περικάθαρεμα, περίψημα.

<sup>72</sup>It is only found 3 times in the sing. in the LXX (Lev. 27,31; Prov.6,3; 13,8). The plural is found 17 times. Barrett, "Background" 6, sharply points out that in λύτρον "the idea of equivalence is central." See further the uses in Josephus, Ant. xii,28.33.46; xiv,107.371; xv,156; War i,274.384; and P. Oxyrh. n.48,1.6 and n.49,1.8, as well as Deissmann, Licht 278.

<sup>73</sup>A. Médebielle, who studied all the uses of λύτρον ("La vie donnée en rançon," Bib. 1923), concluded that in the OT it always means a ransom, not a simple deliverance, i.e. something is paid and something received instead.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. Brown-Driver-Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, and Köhler-Baumgartner, Lexikon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, sub voce, and the recent art. ΠΩΝ in TWAT I, col.463-471, by U. Kellermann. See further G.R. Driver, "Confused Hebrew Roots," in Gaester Anniversary Volume, London 1936, 77f, and L. Moraldi, Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell'Antico Testamento, Rome 1956, esp. 159-181, where he studied the uses of ΠΩΝ.

<sup>75</sup>Moraldi, op.cit., after studying this term cannot decide whether in Isa.53 ΠΩΝ has a technical ritual sense or that of a gift offering (p.167). Brown-Driver-Briggs, Lexicon ad loc., consider it as referring to a compensatory offering, the people's substitute, and explicitly state that it is not a sin-offering as transl. in the RV and AV. Kellermann, ///

ΠΩΝ in itself a restitution: it contains neither the idea of equivalence nor that of exchange, senses which are implicit in λύτρον. On the other hand, λύτρον implies the something given in exchange for something; not so ΠΩΝ.

Given the fact that the LXX never translated ΠΩΝ by λύτρον,<sup>76</sup> most exegetes turned to the understanding that the Suffering Servant is allowed by God to suffer and die as a guilt-offering,<sup>77</sup> for deciding on a possible relation to Isa.53. One thing is certain: λύτρον is not equivalent to ΠΩΝ of Isa.53.<sup>78</sup> In Mk.10,45b λύτρον is most probably used metaphorically and in the sense of the LXX. It could hardly have been meant literally: Jesus did not pay a ransom men had to pay; he did not become a sinner himself. Thus, λύτρον means what is given as a compensation, to give satisfaction so as to obtain favor. Since that is also the primary sense of ΠΩΝ in Isa.53, λύτρον may be a free rendering of it and chosen in order to avoid the strong cultic sense of Isa.53. While, according to Mk.10,45b the ransom is paid with Jesus' voluntary self-sacrifice, according to Isa.53 the suffering of Yahweh's servant is neither chosen nor is it a ransom but an expiation. However, in both texts the one receiving satisfaction is God, the beneficiaries are the πολλοί/οἱ πολλοί, and the cause is their sins.<sup>79</sup> Thus, λύτρον not only echoes ΠΩΝ but apparently reinterprets it in the light of the Jesus-event. As A.J.B. Higgins rightly pointed out, we should not expect the early Church to have lavishly

---

/// art.cit. col.470 affirms: "Das stellvertretende Leiden des Gerechten ist das Schuldopfer für die Vielen. Der Tod des Knechtes bewirkt wie ein Schuldopfer eine Sühneleistung, nämlich die Rettung der Sünder vom Tode." See further E. Kutsch, Sein Leiden und Tod - unser Heil, Neukirchen 1967, and W. Zimmerli, VTS 17(1969), 238ff.

<sup>76</sup>In the LXX ΠΩΝ is translated more often by ἁμαρτία, as is the case in Isa.53,10a, i.e. as a sin-offering! (cf. also Gen. 42,21; Lev.5,7; Num.18,9; 2 Kgs.12,16; 1 Chr.21,3; 28,13). It is also translated by ἄγνοια, ἁδικία, βάσανος, πλημμέλεια. On the other hand, λύτρον translates ἔλα, כפר, רחם, דָּפַן and יָצַן.

<sup>77</sup>Isa.53,5.6d.8d.11d and esp. 10b and 12c, indicate that the reason for his suffering and death is, FOR the people's iniquities/sins: ὡς ἵνα ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας (v.12d).

<sup>78</sup>This was convincingly demonstrated by Barrett, "Background" 6. Differently Lohse, *Märtyrer* 119.

<sup>79</sup>While these elements are mentioned in Isa.53, in the λύτρον-saying there is no reference either to God or to sins, but are presupposed, as evidenced by 1 Cor.15,3 (cf. also Tit. 2,14).

borrowed and used only the vocabulary of the LXX.<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, for Jews the ideas of ransom and of expiation were akin; hence the passage from the one to the other was easy.<sup>81</sup>

(v) The preposition ἀντί, which in Mk occurs only here, has the sense of an exchange (one thing in lieu of another), with a consequent substitutionary connotation "like the genitive of price,"<sup>82</sup> and not "on behalf of."<sup>83</sup> The sense of ἀντί can hardly be precised linguistically except in its context: its relation to λύτρον, which indicates that it "belongs to the imagery of the λύτρον."<sup>84</sup> It has the same meaning as ܐܢܬܝ in Aram. and תחת in Hebr., which is used in Isa.53,12b when referring to the Servant's fate.<sup>85</sup> The use of ἀντί instead of ὑπέρ is not accidental, as can be seen from the words of Institution where ὑπέρ is used (cf. Mk.14,24[ὑπὲρ πολλῶν]/Lk.22,19.20/1 Cor.11,24). Thus a close relation to Isa.53,12b is plausible.<sup>86</sup>

(vi) The substantive πολλῶν, of many, which is predicated of λύτρον, not of δοῦναι, has the Semitic inclusive sense of ܕܝܠܝܕܐ, as in Mk.14,24/Mt.26,28; Rom.5,16; Hebr.9,28.<sup>87</sup> It

<sup>80</sup>Jesus 46, versus Barrett's dogmatism.

<sup>81</sup>Büchsel, TDNT IV 341. The Aram. ܐܢܬܝ means "a ransom" and also "redemption". It is used in the syr<sup>C,P,S</sup> versions of Mk.10,45b. See also the Tg to Ps.49,8f and Job 33,24. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 118ff, analyzed the uses of the Aram.

<sup>82</sup>B1-D §208(2). See also Turner, NTGk III, 258, Moule, Idiom-Book 71, Zerwick, Greek §94, and Büchsel, art. ἀντί, TDNT I, 373, as well as Bauer, ad loc.

<sup>83</sup>This sense is given by Bonnard, Mt 298 ("en faveur de"), Gaechter, Mt 651 ("für, zum besten von"). That is the precise sense of ὑπέρ though. If we relate ἀντί πολλῶν to δοῦναι, instead of to λύτρον that sense is also obtained.

<sup>84</sup>Swete, Mk 241.

<sup>85</sup>The LXX translated תחת (רשׁא) by ἀνθ' ὧν, and the Tg reads ܐܢܬܝ.

<sup>86</sup>Jeremias, in JTS 11(1960), 143, reviewing M. Hooker's book Jesus and the Servant, rightly pointed out that the use of ἀντί instead of ὑπέρ "is scarcely explicable without taking into account Isa.liiii --the connection is of course obscured if only the LXX, and not the Hebrew text, of Isa.liiii is reckoned with."

<sup>87</sup>See Jeremias, art. πολλοί, TDNT VI, 536-539, and idem. Abendmahlsworte 171-174, 218-221. Further O. Cullmann, "ἡ ὄχλος (ἡ ἀντί) πολλῶν," TZ 4(1948), 471-473. The absence of the article suggests that no restrictions were in sight nor a specification of the kind of persons meant is in view. It refers to an indefinite (open) multitude.

opposes the One to the many. A better Gk term is πάντων, as is actually used in 1 Tim.2,6 and which leads one to wonder whether πολλῶν in the sense of ὁ πολλοί, the not-countable many, is not echoing Isa.53 where it occurs no less than five times in the rarely used inclusive sense (52,14a.15a [adj.]; 53,11b.12a.b).<sup>88</sup>

(vii) The expression ἀντὶ πολλῶν, is a current Semitism.<sup>89</sup> Better Gk is the expression found in 1 Tim.2,6: ἀντίλυτρον (πολλῶν). The substitutionary sense of ἀντί and the inclusive sense of πολλῶν, both found in Isa.53,10ff, do not preclude a possible inspiration from Isa.53.<sup>90</sup>

We may now better pose the important question whether Mk.10,45b is inspired or dependent on Isa.53. One conclusion can be drawn from our analysis of the vocabulary used in Mk. 10,45b: any relation to Isa.53 is based on the MT, not on the LXX.<sup>91</sup> Not only the number of Semitisms, but also the similarity in ideas and the fact that Jesus was understood by the early Church as being the Suffering Servant, make a direct inspiration from Isa.53,10ff possible. However, it is not a literal translation.<sup>92</sup> The confluence of so many terms found

<sup>88</sup>The possible relation to Isa.53 is carefully analyzed by J. Jeremias in art. πολλοί, TDNT VI, 544. The all-inclusive sense of ὁ πολλοί is rare in the OT and is peculiar to Isa.53 (ibid. 538); see Ex.23,2; Ps.109,30; Est.4,3; Dan.9,27; 11,33; 12,3; 1 QS 6,1.8.11.14.16f.20.25; 7,3.16.19; CD 15,8. Hebrew and Aramaic do not have a word for "all" in our sense of a sum and totality. (ס)כּל indicates a totality, כּל/כּלל an uncountable sum. Cf. P. Joüon, Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique, Rome 1965, 125, and J. Jeremias, Abendmahlswoorte 171, and art. cit. 536 n.4.

<sup>89</sup>The expression ὁ πολλοί is never found in the OT. However noteworthy are the uses of תּוֹתֵן in Ex.21,23; 1 Kgs.20,39. 42; and 2 Kgs.10,24, all of which have ἀντὶ in the LXX.

<sup>90</sup>Denied by Gaechter, Mt 651 n.22, and Tödt, SM 205, as well as Barrett, "Background" and M. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, London 1959, 74-79. But see most recently Hahn, Hoheitstitel 58-61!

<sup>91</sup>However, Schweizer, Mk 124f, sees the influence of Isa. 53 coming from a Gk speaking community's use of the OT, thus implying the use of the LXX and not the Hebrew text. Médebielle, "La vie donnée" 26, attempts to reconstruct a possible Aram. version thus: כּוֹרֵן תּוֹתֵן סִגְיָא (ו) לְחַיָּתָא נִפְשִׁיהּ and Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 118: wejitten naphschēh purkān hūlāph saggiin.

<sup>92</sup>For Jeremias, NTTh I 292, Mk.10,45b "relates word for word to Isa.53,10f., and indeed to the Hebrew text." A position he has been defending throughout his writings.

in Isa.53 and in Mk.10,45b is not sheer accident! Furthermore, two of the three main realities enunciated in Mk.10,45b correspond to two ideas announced in Isa.53: the laying down of the Servant's soul as a redeeming offering (v.45bα -Isa.53, 10a), and the beneficiaries of that act (v.45bβ -Isa.53,12d). Somewhat different is the key term λύτρον-ΠΩΣ which, as we have seen, are not so far apart even if not identical. Therefore, a relation to Isa.53 cannot, in my opinion, be denied.<sup>93</sup>

## 2. Mk.10,45 and Lk.22,27: The Logion of Service.

### Mk.10,45a/Mt.20,28a

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
οὐκ ἦλθεν  
διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ  
διακονῆσαι

### Lk.22,27b

ἐγὼ  
ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι  
ὥς ὁ διακονῶν.

Even though the terminology differs, the fundamental idea is the same in both: Jesus came to serve. To determine which of these two differing forms of what was one logion preserves best its primitive form, can not be done by literary criteria alone because they come from different traditions. It is especially the terminology employed, the tendencies, and the particular viewpoint expressed that have to be taken into account.

a. "Son of Man" or "I" ? It is generally recognized that where the term "Son of Man" is employed in a parallel to another not having it, the latter is more primitive since the early Church tended to add "Son of Man", not to eliminate it.<sup>94</sup> That is the case here: Lk's (ἐγὼ) εἰμί is older.<sup>95</sup> Since the term "Son of Man" is invariably used in the Passion predictions,<sup>96</sup> it is most probable that an original (ἐγὼ) εἰμί in v.45a was substituted by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου when v.45b was linked to it.

<sup>93</sup> Isa.53 is actually echoed and used quite often in the NT (see the list at the end of the Greek New Testament, ed. K. Aland et al.). A relation to Isa.53 is challenged by Barrett in "Background" and again in "A Ransom", as well as by his compatriot M. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, 74-79.

<sup>94</sup> See esp. Tödt, SM 208, 211, and Jeremias, "Schicht" 166-169.

<sup>95</sup> Thus also Colpe, in TDNT VIII, 448. To the contrary, for Higgins, Jesus 38, ἐγὼ is a product of a Hellenistic community, replacing the Palestinian ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>96</sup> Mk.8,31; 9,31; 10,33; Lk.11,30; 17,24f; 22,48; 24,7.

V.45b is an interpretative prediction of Jesus' death. We may further precise that it is highly probable that while v.45a was an ἐγώ-saying, v.45b was a separate SM-saying which falls into the same general category as the Passion predictions.

It is difficult to determine whether in the oral stage the saying was in terms of "coming", as in Mt/Mk, or of "being present", as in Lk. On the one hand, it may be argued that since the whole Lkan pericope is in terms of "being",<sup>96</sup> and the present tense εἰμί indicates a continuous presence which corresponds to the Lkan conception of Jesus as the κύριος,<sup>97</sup> then (ἐγὼ) εἰμί would be a product of the Lkan tradition. On the other hand, it can also be argued that Mk's ἦλθεν (+ inf.) was introduced at the time when ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου took the place of an original ἐγώ, and v.45a.b were linked. In fact, a verb of movement, especially ἐρχεσθαι, is associated with "Son of Man" more than half the time that that title is used.<sup>98</sup> It is not impossible that both are variant interpretative renderings of the same Aram. verb אָלָא which primarily means "I came" but also "I am here."<sup>99</sup>

#### b. The Oldest Form of the Logion and its Later Development.

We have noted earlier that pre-Lk, as pre-Mk, already found the present structure in his source and that each one developed it in line with his own presuppositions and outlooks. The double rhetorical question of v.27a was already in Lk's source. The logion about Jesus' exemplary service, which differs in Mt/Mk and Lk, is the result of different tradition

<sup>96</sup>V.24: εἶναι; v.26a: a tacit εἶναι; v.26b: Lk's γινέσθω for ἔστω; v.28: ἔστε.

<sup>97</sup>The duration and permanent existential presence of Jesus since his coming was already expressed by the pft. ἐλήλυθα (for Mk's ἦλθεν, q.v.) in Lk.5,32; see also Lk.7,34. Schürmann, *Ab-schiedsrede* 87, expressed the opinion that if Lk had before him Mk's ἦλθεν he would neither have rejected nor changed it. This is also true of their pre-final redactional sources.

<sup>98</sup>With ἐρχεσθαι we find it in Mt.10,23; 11,19; 16,27.28; 18,11; 24,30.44; 25,31; Lk.9,56a; 12,40; 18,8; 19,10.

<sup>99</sup>Cf. Roloff, "Anfänge" 57 and Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 259. It is difficult to conceive a change from μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι or ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι to ἦλθεν, or viceversa, on the basis of the Gk, but not so on that of the Aram. אָלָא. This may also indicate that it was at this stage that "SM" was probably introduced into the picture in the Mkan tradition.



developments but had at the origin the same saying: what was it?

We have already pointed out that v.45a was not a SM-saying but had been in the first person. The alternative terms ἦλθον-(ἐγὼ) εἰμί were probably the result of different Gk renderings of the same Aram. verb: ܠܬܠܝܬ. <sup>100</sup> In the pre-Mkan version, once v.45b (which was a SM logion) was joined to v.45a, the subject of both sayings was unified to create a solid unity. This brought along an inconsistency, viz. the SM is said to serve, while in Dan.7 and 1 En. he does not serve but is served! Thus, the clause οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ was introduced as a corrective by pre-Mk. <sup>101</sup> Because v.45b is a Passion-related saying, ἦλθεν, and not ἔστιν was used (δοῦναι cannot have εἶναι as a verb), and then moved to v.45a. It is to be noted that the οὐκ (+ ἔρχεσθαι) - ἀλλὰ clauses always point to some sort of corrective. <sup>102</sup> This would leave us with ἦλθον διακονῆσαι as logion in the source of pre-Mk which, as is at once evident, is too brief to have constituted an independent logion. It remains possible that, esp. if the verb was εἰμί and not ἦλθον, instead of the verb διακονεῖν the substantive διάκονος (cf. Mk.9,35) or even δοῦλος (cf. v.44; Mk.12,1-12 par.; Mt.22,1-10) was present in pre-Mk's source and which was changed for the verb to indicate purpose in connection with ἦλθον. <sup>103</sup> At any rate, it must have spoken of Jesus' servitude.

<sup>100</sup>See n.99 above. The Codex Bezae reads ἐγὼ ... ἦλθον οὐχ ὡς ἀνακείμενος ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ διακονῶν, .... A. de Santos Otero, *Evangelijs Apócrifos* 121, classes this as Agraphon n.9. See the remarks by H.W. Beyer, in *TDNT* II, 84, and Black, *Aramaic* 128f, who considers it to be an original Aramaic logion.

<sup>101</sup>If, as I suppose, the οὐκ-clause was added later as a corrective, then this would be an added evidence for the older form as preserved in Lk --where there is no οὐκ-clause.

<sup>102</sup>Cf. Mt.5,17b; 9,13 par.; 10,34b. The Semitic dialectic οὐκ-ἀλλὰ is absent in the Lkan par. to Mk.3,26.29; 4,17.22; 5,19.26; 9,37; 11,31f; 12,25.27; 13,11a.b.20. However, from this one cannot conclude that Lk avoids this type of formulation because we find it in Lk.8,27; 12,51; 13,3.5; 16,30; 18,13; 24,6, none of which has a par. in Mt or Mk. See also Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede* 84, who concludes that there is no reason why Lk would have omitted οὐκ-ἀλλὰ if he had had it before him.

<sup>103</sup>Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 262, maintains that διακονηθῆναι - διακονῆσαι is original. However, we have no example of a use of διακονηθῆναι in Hebr. or Aram. --certainly not with the verbs ܠܬܠܝܬ and ܠܬܠܝܬ (Qoh.5,8 is doubtful and the Nif. of ܠܬܠܝܬ disputed: is the king served by the earth or is he an agriculturer?). On this see n.66, *supra*. Nevertheless, there is at least one ///

In Luke the expression ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν may have been an adaptation of an older expression for "being with", such as μεθ' ὑμῶν (ܡܬܝܬܝܢ). A change to "in the midst of you" is understandable as an expression of a community's awareness of the presence of Christ (cf. Mk.18,20; Lk.24,36; Acts 2,22). Such a change could be thought as operated by Lk himself in view of the meal context.<sup>104</sup> It was already indicated that the part. διακονῶν was probably formed by Lk from his source's διάκονος, to match the preceeding participial nouns; it repeats v.26b.

Thus, it results that, if our analysis is correct, the oldest form of the logion was better preserved in the Lkan than in the Mt/Mkan tradition.<sup>105</sup> The history of this logion's for-

---

/// example of the passive of ὤνῳ (in Hitpaël), a verb not used thus in the OT, viz. in bBer.52b: "you must not be waited upon (ܡܬܝܬܝܢ) by an ignorant servant"; this is also the verb used by the syr. at Mk.10,45a. In fact, it seems probable that this verb would lie at the origin of διακονεῖν, thus also Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 117f, and Roloff, "Anfänge" 52.

Besides the problem with the passive διακονηθῆναι, two other considerations seem to argue against the antiquity of the οὐκ- clause, viz. the dependence of ἤλθεν on SM and the fact that a correction to the current conception of the SM as one who was served had to be made.

<sup>104</sup> ἐν μέσῳ + gen. occurs 3/2/7+4 times. For some exegetes Lk.22,27 says in words what John reports as Jesus' washing of the disciples' feet (13,4-17), thus Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 260, Feuillet, "Le Logion" 378, but is formally rejected by Schmid, Lk 328 and Roloff, art.cit. 58. In this respect it is to be noted that (1) this suggestion supposes that v.27 was always linked to the Last Supper, and (2) that at the Last Supper, as reported by Lk, Jesus acted as pater familias and not as servant. The washing of feet, according to current custom, had to be done at the beginning, before the meal took place. John places it after the meal to show the connection between table-fellowship and service. This was what Lk probably also wanted to convey by placing v.24-27 after the Last Supper.

<sup>105</sup> To the contrary Bousset, Kyrios Christos 9 n.1, Bultmann, ST 93, 151, and Büchsel, in TDNT IV, 342 n.17, who consider the Mkan logion to be a reworking of Lk's. Best, Temptation 140, sees Lk's as an adaptation of Mk's; similarly Rese, Motive 162f. For Suhl, Zitate 115, and Hooker, SM 143f, Lk's logion is older because it does not contain the title "Son of Man". According to Branscomb, Mk 190f, Lk's is older because it is "in line with what precedes". Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 92, concludes that because there are few redactional changes in Lk's logion it is older. Klostermann, Mk 109, Hahn, Hohelstittel 45 n.2, Schweizer, Mk 124, and Schmid, Lk 329, likewise consider Lk's form more primitive than Mk's. Of a different opinion are Lohse, Märtyrer 117ff, Feuillet, "Le Logion" 373, 378, Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 261f, who deem that Mk's logion is older because of its Semitisms. But, even though this is true for v.45b, it need not be so for v.45a! Higgins, Jesus 38, is of the opinion that Mk's is older because SM is older than ἐγώ. According to Roloff, art.cit. 52, Mk's is older on account ///

mation followed the inverse path of that which was so far delineated.<sup>106</sup> Its earliest form can be conjectured to have been ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς δίακονος/εἰς διακονῆσαι(...). This, I admit, is highly conjectural. What is certain is that it had the form of a declaration in the first person sing. and for content the position of Jesus as servant, with the root διακον-. It is by far more likely that it was formulated in terms of εἶναι than of ἐρχεσθαι.

c. Did the Lukan Tradition Know the Ransom-logion?

There are two possible explanations for the absence of the λύτρον-saying in Lk: either it was intentionally omitted or it was not known. Both possibilities have been proposed and defended as explanations for the absence of Mk.10,45b in Lk.

The explanation as an intentional omission begins from the presupposition of the Syn "Two Sources Theory". It is pointed out that Lk omits other references or allusions to atonement.<sup>107</sup> As a counterargument Lk.22,19f can be pointed to. In fact, Lk.22,19f could be invoked as an argument for the omission of the λύτρον-saying on the grounds that Lk did not want to repeat

/// of the absence of redactional traces. For Bonnard, Mt 298, Schulz, Nachfolge 253, 264, and Boismard, Synopse 386, Mk's may be older --but it is not absolutely certain.

<sup>106</sup>Bousset, Kyrios Christos 9 n.1, sees the following development of Mk.10,45a out of Lk: 1. introduction of "SM", 2. introduction of the formula ἡλθεν, 3. introduction of the phrase οὐκ διακονηθῆναι as opposition-phrase, and 4. a glossing over the διακονῆσαι through the reference to the sacrificial death.

Higgins, Jesus 49, contemplated the following stages of development: 1. a saying of Jesus, "I shall give my life as a ransom for many," 2. change to "SM", and 3. the present form of the saying and insertion of the reference to service suggested by the theme of v.43f.

Most recently, Roloff, "Anfänge" 59 n.2, distinguishes the following phases: 1. a logion about service, Lk.22,27b (or 27a. b?) as part of a meal-story (Lk.20,15-20), 2. enrichment through the "Jüngerlogien" (Mk.10,42-44), 3. beginning of the mutations in the two traditions: (a) pre-Mkan tradition: separation from the meal story by taking on v.45b, (b) S-Lk tradition: parenetic transformation within the meal story through constitution of a community rule. Finally, 4. a redactional phase: (a) Mk.10,42-45 is incorporated into the rules for the disciples given in 10,35-45; (b) incorporation into the Lkan farewell speech.

Schürmann, Abschiedsrede 82, 90, had come to similar conclusions as Roloff.

<sup>107</sup>Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, New York 1927, 280, and Rese, Motive 98, 100ff, 161f.

what was already said a few verses earlier in solemn manner.<sup>108</sup> It is also plausible to think that Lk omitted the ransom-saying simply because it did not suit the main argument of v.25f as it had been developed.<sup>109</sup>

The alternative to the explanation of omission is that of not having known this logion.<sup>110</sup> This is argued mostly on the bases that Lk would be following a special source where this logion was not found. It would have been added by pre-Mk or by Mk. This contention finds support in the fact that SM is never left out by Lk when he finds it in his Mkan source (except Lk.22,22b/Mk.14,21b).<sup>111</sup> This would support our contention that Mk.10,45a had not been a SM-saying, and that Lk did not know Mk directly. However, a counterargument would be that Lk did omit Mk.10,35-45 intentionally (cf. §A, *supra*) and also that, as we already pointed out, Lk wanted neither to repeat v.19f nor to force the  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\omicron\nu$ -saying into the argument of v.25f. The omission of Mk.10,35-45 does not mean that it was transposed but rather, in the light of our analysis of the Lkan discourse, that Lk depends directly on a special source.

<sup>108</sup>See esp. H. Schürmann, "Die Dublettenvermeidungen im Lukasevangelium," *ZTK* 76(1954), 83-93. Verses 19f have more chances of being authentic than not; ita,d,ff<sup>2</sup>,i,l and syrh omitted them. See Grundmann, *Lk* 395ff (+ bibliography) and esp. Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte* 133-145.

<sup>109</sup>For Bultmann, Supplement of 1962 to *ST* (p.144 n.1), 410, Lk does not proceed from a special source, as the majority of scholars hold, but Lk and Mk are in his opinion "literarily connected"; see also his p. 93 and 335. Best, *Temptation* 140f, holds that "the Markan saying has been modified to suit the Lukan context of Church discipline" and that "to this Mark x. 45b was irrelevant, and it was therefore dropped." Cf. also R.H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, London 1954, 57.

J. Jeremias, "Perikopen Umstellung bei Lukas?," *NTS* 4(1957/58), 115-119, like Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, and often in his articles, does not consider it a transposition but the use of a special source. To the contrary, F. Neirynck, "The Argument from Order and St Luke's Transpositions," *ETL* 49(1973), 784-815, and H.F.D. Sparks, "St Luke's Transpositions," *NTS* 3(1956/57), 219-223, argue in terms of transpositions of material done by Lk. But see F. Rehkopf's dissertation *Die lukanische Sonderquelle*, Tübingen 1959.

<sup>110</sup>Hirsch, *Frügeschichte* I, 116, Colpe, in *TDNT* VIII, 455, Grundmann, *Lk* 400f, and esp. Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede* esp. 83, propose this explanation. But see Rese's comments, *Motive* 163.

<sup>111</sup>Cf. Schürmann, *op.cit.* 86, and Jeremias, "Schicht" 159.

The explanation that the ransom-saying was not present there seems to me the most probable.

3. Mk.10,45b, 1 Tim.2,6a, and Tit.2,13c.14a.

<u>Mt/Mk</u>	<u>1 Tim.</u>	<u>Tit.</u>
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ... (καὶ) δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.	ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, ....	Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν  ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρωσῇται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας....

There is not much that needs to be said about these texts for they speak for themselves. It is at once evident that 1 Tim. and Tit. are exactly the same formula as that of Mt/Mk, but transcribed into good Hellenistic Greek. Their differences put the Palestinian tone and origin of the text in Mt/Mk as well as its priority, into evidence.<sup>112</sup> It is hardly conceivable that pre-Mk, writing in Gk, would have reverted the polished formulation of 1 Tim. and Tit. (if he knew them!); the contrary is much more plausible.

4. Mk.10,45b and the Words over the Cup (Mk.14,24b par.).

We shall not engage ourselves in a full study of the words of institution pronounced over the cup as transmitted by Paul and the Synoptics, but will content ourselves with a few observations that the comparison with the λύτρον-saying suggest.

<sup>112</sup>Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 260, Lohse, Märtyrer 119, and Suhl, Zitate 119, consider the comparison of both texts of capital importance for the determination of the Palestinian origin of Mk's text, and rightly so.

According to Branscomb, Mk 191, the term λύτρον is due to Pauline influence and "the Gospel belongs undoubtedly to the Pauline school." Schniewind, Mk 143, considers v.45b to be due to an interpretation of Jesus' death in Pauline communities - which seems to me quite plausible. For Feuillet, "Le Logion" 369, there was a literary contact but not dependence. However, it should be observed that in none of the Pauline writings we find the terms SM, λύτρον, or ἀντὶ πολλῶν. There also exist other terms used by Mk and which are frequent in Paul's pen (cf. Taylor, Mk 125ff). Should we expect them to use different words for the same ideas? After all, they use the same language and lean on the same basic tradition on the foundations of which each community developed its own theology and interpretations-explanations. The ideas of ransom and of redemption were not totally foreign in Judaism. Finally, ///

The concept of Jesus' self-offering for the many is to be found on his lips only again in the words over the cup at the Last Supper. The close relation between these words and the λύτρον-saying will be at once evident when placed synoptically:

<u>Mk.10,45b par.</u>	<u>Mk.14,24b</u>	<u>Mt.26,28</u>
... καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης	τοῦτο (γὰρ) ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ <u>περὶ</u> πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον ....
λύτρον <u>ἀντὶ</u> πολλῶν.	τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον <u>ὑπὲρ</u> πολλῶν.	

<u>Lk.22,19b.20b</u>	<u>1 Cor.11,25b</u>
...τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ <u>ὑπὲρ</u> ὑμῶν <u>διδόμενον</u> ... τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ <u>ὑπὲρ</u> ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.	...τὸ σῶμα τὸ <u>ὑπὲρ</u> ὑμῶν... τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι....

Mk's text preserves best the original words over the cup.<sup>113</sup> In all there is question of Jesus' self-offering and of his doing so "for many (Lk/1 Cor. for us)". The "Bildwort" differs but has the same basic reality in mind: ψυχὴ (ωϩΙ) and αἷμα (ΠΓ) are terms which in a Semite's mind refer to life, contemplated under two complementary aspects. Furthermore, it is remarkable that, as it was for Mk.10,45b, the key terms (ἐκχύνω, ὑπὲρ πολλῶν) and concepts (αἷμα, διαθήκη) echo Isa.53.

The expressions δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ and τὸ αἷμά μου ἐκχυννόμενον correspond to each other and echo Isa.53,12b הָגִן (תָּגִן).<sup>114</sup> The preposition ὑπὲρ, "for", "on behalf of",<sup>115</sup> supposes a Hebr. or Aram. Urtext and is a translation variant

/// 1 Tim.2,6 shows that if there was an influence it was from Mk.10,45b to the former and not the inverse. See the reflections of Taylor, Mk 125-129.

<sup>113</sup>See among others Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte, esp. p.165 and 181, and H. Schürmann, Der Einsetzungsbericht, Münster 1955.

<sup>114</sup>The LXX reads παρεδόθη (εἰς θάνατον). Cf. Wolff, Jesaja 53, 66, Hahn, Hoheitstitel 61, and Jeremias, op.cit. 170. In p.218, Jeremias (op.cit.) proposes the reconstruction of the Aram. as probably having been: ܝܚܝܕ ܝܢ ܬܦܬܫܝܬ.

<sup>115</sup>See Bauer, ad voce, H. Riesenfeld, art. ὑπὲρ, TDNT VIII, 507-516 (esp. 510f), and Hahn, op.cit. 55-57.

of Mk.10,45b's ἀντί.<sup>116</sup> Though not used as such in Isa.53, ὑπέε is in line with v.5.11.12 (תנת). As in Mk.10,45b, the substantive πολλῶν, and the expression ὑπέε πολλῶν, allude likewise to Isa.53,12 (MT).<sup>117</sup> The close connection between the concept of διαθήκη (a very Semitic/OT concept) and of pouring one's blood (=one's death) for the benefit of many is already present in Isa.53.<sup>118</sup> There is, therefore, an indication of the antiquity of Mk.14,24b, versus 10,45b, not only in that it echoes the MT --and not the version of the LXX-- of Isa.53, but also in its Semitic construction.<sup>119</sup>

We may ask whether the formulation of Mk.10,45b or that of 14,24b is older. While 14,24b is closer to the Passion and is directly related to that event which it anticipates, 10,45b looks back at the whole of Jesus' life, all the more so once attached to v.45a. The preposition ὑπέε, in 14,24b, does not bear any marked implications of a substitution, but limits itself to underlining the beneficial quality of Jesus' death (analogous to the qualities of the OT sacrifices), and echoes the Jewish conception of the redemptive value of a martyr's death. In Mk.10,45b ἀντί includes the idea of substitution and shows a deeper understanding of Jesus' death in the light of Isa.53. Thus, it would seem that 14,24b was an earlier step in the interpretation of Jesus' death in the light of Isa.53.<sup>120</sup>

<sup>116</sup>Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte 165, 171. H. Riesenfeld, art. ὑπέε, TDNT VIII, 510, 511 n.21.

<sup>117</sup>The fact that ὑπέε is not found in the LXX of Isa.53, and that it expresses the same fundamental idea as ἀντί in Mk.10,45b, which reflects back on תנת... תנת of Isa.53,12, is an indication that it was already part of the Palestinian tradition, before the LXX was fully in use. Jeremias, op.cit. 165, 171, and Riesenfeld, art.cit. 510, rightly consider ὑπέε πολλῶν as belonging to "the oldest stratum of the Gospel tradition" (*ibid.*).

<sup>118</sup>Wolff, Jesaja 53, 65, Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua 162ff. I suspect a close association between the concepts of covenant and ὑπέε: the benefit of the πολλῶν is a (new) covenant.

<sup>119</sup>Noteworthy is the word order, which is that of Hebr./Aram., as evidenced by the position of the preposition ὑπέε, which forced the redactor to use a participial construction.

<sup>120</sup>Roloff, "Anfänge" 59, points out that giving his life "for many" in 10,45b is a formal abbreviation of Mk.14,24b. On the absence of the λύτρον-idea in 14,24b see below.

Compared with 14,24b we may advance the following hypothesis: the key term λύτρον, with its definite Greek connotation of equivalence (ἀντί), may have been added to the logion of Mk.10,45b by pre-Mk. If we remove λύτρον the saying continues to make perfect sense and shows a close dependence on Isa.53, and likewise a resemblance with the (older) saying in 14,24b. It can also be thought that λύτρον took the place of a Gk equivalent to ΠΩΛ', such as ἀλλαγμα or ἐξίλασμα, in order to bring out in full the sense of Jesus' death and to depart from any cultic connotation. This phenomenon would explain the difficulty we find with the term λύτρον in a logion that otherwise is Semitic.

Nowhere else do we find on the lips of Jesus a logion giving as purpose of his death the ransom of many. We do find a number of texts referring to this quality of Jesus' death: Rom.3,24 (ἀπολύτρωσις); 1 Cor.1,30 (ἀπολύτρωσις); Eph.1,7 (ἀπολύτρωσιν); Col.1,14 (ἀπολύτρωσιν); 1 Tim.2,6 (ἀντίλυτρον); Tit. 2,14 (λυτρώσῃται) and Hebr.9,12 (λύτρωσιν) as well as other texts which, without using the cognate λυτρ-, show a similar understanding of Jesus' death.<sup>121</sup>

The oldest reference to Jesus' death as a salvific event seems to be that found in v.3b of the credal formula in 1 Cor. 15: Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ....<sup>122</sup> This text, like Mk.10,45b alludes to Isa.53. The abundance of similar references emanating from Paul (esp. Rom.3,24; 4,25; 5,6f; 14,15; 1 Cor.8,11; 2 Cor.5,15; 1 Th.5,10) suggests that such an understanding of Jesus' death had in effect an origin other than in Jesus himself. In this respect it is to be noted that, while found often in Paul's and later NT writings, in the Syn it occurs only in Mk.10,45b par. and 14,24b par. Furthermore, the technical term λύτρον does not occur again in its simple form in the whole NT, and if it was said by Jesus as giving the key to the sense of his coming death, one may wonder why it was not used again. The other uses of the cognate λυτρ- occur only

<sup>121</sup>Eg. Jn.11,50f; 15,13; Mt.26,28b; Rom.3,24; 4,25; 5,6ff; 8,32; 14,15b; 1 Cor.8,11; 15,3b; 2 Cor.5,15; 1 Th.5,10; Eph.5,2; Gal.1,4; 1 Pet.1,18f; 2,21-24; 3,18.

<sup>122</sup>See among others H. Conzelmann, "Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel 1.Kor.15,3-5," *EvT* 25(1965), 1-11.



in texts having a Hellenistic "setting in life", and the idea of substitution is found only in late texts (Jn.11,50f; 15,13; 1 Tim.2,6; 1 Pet.2,21-24).<sup>123</sup>

#### Conclusion: The Ransom-Saying and Jesus.

The outcome of our foregoing discussion is, among other things, an awareness that the logion of Mk.10,45b par. in its present form could not have been pronounced by Jesus. A shadow of doubt about the authenticity of this logion has projected itself over it.

An added result of our analysis is a closer approximation to the form this logion may have had if one could think it was actually pronounced by Jesus. Thus, the following affirmations can be made: (1) if Jesus ever announced his death with a saying like that of Mk.10,45b, it was not in terms of the SM for, that form belongs to the Passion predictions which, as is almost universally recognized, were not formulated by Jesus --certainly not in their present form. Likewise, (2) the key word λύτρεον, a product of later Hellenically influenced reflection, could hardly have been included in this logion, as the Words of Institution testify. And, (3) the value of Jesus' death would have been said to be ὑπὲρ (not ἀντὶ) πολλῶν -- if mentioned at all. That means that the older form of the ransom-saying probably read: ἦλθεν δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

#### E. The Authenticity of the Ransom-Saying.

We have reached the point where we have to take a closer look at the question of the authenticity of the ransom-saying, in its probable earliest form, which we have just reached. We shall therefore examine the logion in the light of the four authenticating criteria which we have been applying to other logia.

1. Criterion of Multiple Attestation. It has already been noted that the same idea as that contained in our ransom-saying, is attested mostly in texts which are either late or of Hellenistic origin. Without the terms ἀντὶ and λύτρεον, i.e. in the simpler (and earlier) form, our logion is in resonance

---

<sup>123</sup>See our discussion of ὑπὲρ and ἀντὶ, above, as well as Roloff, "Anfänge" 44ff.

with the Words of Institution, especially those over the cup (cf. §D.4, above). The ex-eventu predictions of the Passion, on the other hand, are formulated in different terms. Our logion, however, finds repeated echo in the Gospel of John. Thus, in the discourse about the Good Shepherd, we find four times a direct reference to Jesus' giving his life for his sheep: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν<sup>124</sup> ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων (10,11) and, τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων (10,15b; cf. also v.17), and more explicitly in 10,18a: ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν [i.e. τὴν ψυχὴν μου] ἅπ' ἑμαυτοῦ. In the same vein runs the Johannine comment made in 11,51b-52. Finally, in Jn.15,13 we find the moving affirmation, "greater love than this no one has, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ". Our logion also finds a direct echo in the kerygmatic assertions of Gal.1,4a (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν...; cf. 2,20b), 1 Tim.2,6a and Tit.2,14 (cf. p. 147, above), as well as 1 Jn.3,16. Evidently, all of these are post-Paschal. These show the extent to which Jesus' death as a self-offering was understood and appretiated in the early Church.

The kerygmatic affirmations are all late formulations. The logia in Jn above mentioned, are all products of the Johannine theology.<sup>124a</sup> And, compared with the words over the cup, we had concluded that Mk.14,24b was probably more primitive than our ransom-saying.

2. The Criterion of Language. The Semitisms and the allusion to the MT of Isa.53,10.12, suggest a Hebrew or Aramaic speaking "setting in life". Even though it alludes to Isa.53, it is to be observed that our logion does no more than that: no portion of it is cited. A retroversion into Aram. (and Hebr.) is not impossible;<sup>125</sup> this is, however, no guarantee of authenticity, only of possible antiquity.

<sup>124</sup> Τίθησιν is the reading of P66.75, ℵ<sup>c</sup>, B, ita, aur, e, f, l syr<sup>p, h, sa</sup>, et al., while in P<sup>45</sup>, ℵ<sup>\*</sup>, D, vg, it<sup>c, d</sup>, syr<sup>s, bo</sup>, we find δίδωσιν. The former is more Johannine and hence probably the original reading. Similarly in v.15b.

<sup>124a</sup> See the commentaries to John, especially by R. Bultmann and R. Schnackenburg, ad loc.

<sup>125</sup> See n.91, supra. The Hebr. would read: בצתי לחת נפש לרבים

3. The Criterion of Coherence. We already pointed out that the logion under study is in perfect resonance with the words over the cup, and shows a more developed understanding of the sense of Jesus' death. However, nowhere else is it reported that Jesus saw death as the purpose of his mission. By far more frequent are the statements that death (and suffering) would be inflicted upon him, i.e. that it would be imposed upon him by others!

4. The Criterion of Discontinuity. It is this criterion which, even though not named, is the decisive one for most exegetes.

We must first take a closer look at the Jewish background and understanding to which our logion may correspond. The idea of an expiatory death, which was foreign to the Greco-Hellenistic world, was not at all foreign in contemporary Judaism. The death of the just (already in Isa.53!) and that of a martyr were considered as having an atoning value.<sup>126</sup> This is particularly apparent for the latter since the persecution of Antiochus in Maccabean times.<sup>127</sup> The idea of a vicarious ransom is nevertheless absent in the Books of Maccabees, but the aspect of corporate personality is dominant. However, even though the idea of a just's and/or a martyr's death may have had its part in the formation of this logion,<sup>128</sup> at least three aspects inherent in our logion bring out a difference in views: (1) a suffering Messiah (and his atoning death) was foreign to Judaism, (2) Jesus' death was understood to be an unsurpassable and unique event which differs in its once-for-all aspect from the death of other just men and martyrs, and

<sup>126</sup>Cf. Lohse, Martyrer 29-32, and Roloff, "Anfänge" 47f. See further Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 250-257, for an analysis of what or who could have served an expiatory purpose.

<sup>127</sup>Cf. 1 Mac.2,50; 2 Mac.6,28; 7,9.18.33.37f; 8,21; and esp. 4 Mac.1,11; 6,28f; 17,21f.27f; 18,4. See further Josephus, Ant.I,230f(on Isaac's death); jSanh.xi,30c.28; Midrash Ps.118, 18 and Song of Songs 1,14; Siphre to Dt.32,43. To these may well be added the tradition on the Aqedah! For a detailed analysis see Lohse, op.cit. 29-32, 64-110, and most recently L. Ruppert, Der leidende Gerechte, Würzburg 1972.

<sup>128</sup>L. Ruppert, synthesizing and applying the results of his Habilitationsschrift (op.cit.), has studied this subject in detail with regard to Jesus in Jesus als der leidende Gerechte, Stuttgart 1972. It is noteworthy that Jesus is called "the just", as a sort of title, in Mt.27,19; Lk.23,47; Acts 3,14; 7,52; 22,14; 1 Jn.2,1, and these in connection with his death!

(3) a limited corporate dimension, as that dominant in the OT and Judaism, is absent in Mk.10,45b par. where the concept of an unlimited universal redemptive value is introduced.<sup>129</sup>

The influence of Isa.53 on this logion seems to me unquestionable, not only because of the resemblances in terminology, but also because of the same fundamental ideas that relate these unique texts. It is not improbable that the current concept of a martyr's death as redemptive led to a more solid basis, viz. Isa.53, which describes most clearly the sufferings of a man of God. Isa.53 was indeed a text well suited for the interpretation of Jesus' death. In it we already find the suffering-exaltation schema. It is the same schema that frames the interpretation of a martyr's death.<sup>130</sup> An identification of Jesus with the 'Ebed Yahweh', though somewhat modified, is to me also unquestionable. However, here also do we find a difference between Isa.53 and our logion: not only the (later added)  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$  is absent in Isa.,<sup>131</sup> but also the unlimited extent of  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ . Since 1st. cent. Judaism did not interpret --as far as we know-- Isa.53 as referring to a suffering Messiah,<sup>132</sup> the interpretation and application we find in our logion did not come directly from Judaism but from a Judeo-Christian milieu.

We can press this question one step further and ask whether Jesus could have understood his impending death in terms of Isa.53, or as that of a just-martyr. He most certainly did not interpret it in terms of the understanding of Isa.53 common among his contemporaries. If Jesus was aware of the current understanding of Isa.53 and did consider himself to be the 'Ebed Yahweh', then considerably more explanation and

<sup>129</sup>Lohse, Märtyrer 120; Roloff, "Anfänge" 48ff; Hahn, Heilstitel 56. See also Justin's Dial. Tryphon, 140.

<sup>130</sup>See further Ruppert, Jesus passim, esp.74f.

<sup>131</sup>The idea of a substitution, as is clearly expressed by the preposition  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$ , does not come from Isa.53, nor from the Jewish conception of a just/martyr's death. It probably originated in the early Church when Jesus' divinity became apparent --with the resurrection as central event-- from which the hope that God himself would redeem his people, a notion which had been expressed in the later prophets and the apocalyptic literature had prepared the way (cf. also Lk.24,21!), was awakened. Cf. Lohse, op.cit. 121, and Hooker, SM 144.

<sup>132</sup>Cf. Lohse, op.cit. 104-110, and Roloff, art.cit. 44f.

clarification than just this logion would have been necessary. It is also to be noted that here Isa.53 is not being used as a fulfilment or proof-text but as a source of interpretation and as background.<sup>133</sup> Jesus could have foreseen his death as that of a just-martyr and have expounded on its atoning value, but whether he saw it as substitutionary and as a λύτρον is most doubtful. The idea of his death as a ransom may have come in with that of sin as slavery (cf. Rom.6; 8,2; Col.2,13f; 2 Tim. 2,26). As already indicated, the λύτρον-idea being a Church understanding probably goes back to a Gentile-Christian milieu.<sup>134</sup> It follows that Jesus could have understood his approaching death, not necessarily in terms of Isa.53 but, which is more likely, in that of the current understanding of a just-martyr's death as having atoning value with a corporate dimension, or even as suffering the fate of the prophets of old.<sup>135</sup> It follows also that Jesus could hardly have pronounced the logion of Mk.10,45b in any of its forms: it says much more than what he as a son of his times could have foreseen. What was bequeathed to us was a theologumenon, a Christological-soteriological interpretation based on Isa.53.<sup>136</sup> In its final form

<sup>133</sup>See Suhl, Zitate 120, Tödt, SM 206, and Hahn, Hoheitstitel 57. I think this answers Feuillet's ("Le Logion" 398) and Wolff's (Jesaja 53, 59) question why, if Isa.53 was used by the early Church --and not by Jesus,-- was it not cited.

<sup>134</sup>Thus also Johnson, Mt 180, Bultmann, ST 93 ("a well-known dogmatic transformation"), 144 (Mk "has formed its conception of Jesus from the redemption theories of Hellenistic Christianity"), Klostermann, Mk 109; cf. also Barrett, "Ransom" 21. To the contrary, Wolff, op.cit. 59f, Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 262f, Higgins, Jesus 48, and McNeile, Mt 290, consider the λύτρον idea to go back to Jesus himself.

<sup>135</sup>Jones, Mk 166, Wolff, op.cit. 55-71, Jeremias, lately in his art. πᾶς θεός, TDNT V, 706f, 712-715, van Iersel, Der Sohn 65, are of the opinion that Jesus interpreted his forthcoming death in terms of Isa.53. An intermediate position is adopted by H. Schürmann in his studies now collected in idem, Jesu ureigener Tod, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1974, c.I.

<sup>136</sup>Conzelmann, NTTh 134; Bultmann, ST 93; Lohse, Märtyrer 116ff; Higgins, Jesus 48; Tödt, SM 207; Hahn, op.cit. 59; Kuhn, Sammlungen 154; Haenchen, Weg 367; Branscomb, Mk 190; Schweizer, Mk 125; Grundmann, Mk 220; Barrett, art.cit. 21; Roloff, "Anfänge" passim, likewise consider this logion a Church dogmatic interpretation. For Schelkle, Passion 135; Manson, Messiah 127; Wolff, op.cit. 59f; Jeremias, "Lösegeld" 262f; Feuillet, art.cit. 401; Cranfield, Mk 343; McNeile, Mt 290; Gaechter, Mt 651; and Taylor, Mk 446, this logion is an authentic saying of Jesus.

it is a crystallization of an understanding, well thought out and assimilated by the early Church, of the sense of Jesus' death. To this witness not only the texts we referred to in p.150, but also the fact that a life as a ransom for all was foreign to Judaism.

Conclusion. In view of the long, and at times tedious and repetitious foregoing discussion, the following can be affirmed: Jesus did not use the term (and idea strictly therein contained) λύτρον, and there was no thought of substitution in stricto sensu. To put it briefly, this logion (in any of its forms) was formulated by the early Church and not by the historical Jesus.

#### F. The Redactor's Outlook.

Throughout the previous paragraphs we had to point out the redactional elements and motives that brought about the present composition of our pericope and climaxing logion. Consequently, I will not repeat these but limit myself to some additional remarks and observations.

The intention behind the piecing together of the discourse of Mk.10,42-45 par. and its linking with the Zebedees' request is clear: a teaching for the community (hence the additions ἐν ὑμῖν and ὑμῶν) on true greatness, be it in the Kingdom (v.35-40) or within the community (v.42-45). Pre-Mk has preserved this motive and composition of his source. The key is given by v.42b-43a (greatness is not to be thought of as the world does) and v.45a (Jesus' example), followed by a concrete description of what this principle involves. This paradoxical principle of greatness through humility, which is foreign to Judaism and the Gentile world, undoubtedly has its origin in words and deeds of Jesus himself.<sup>137</sup> A social order, different from that of the world, is proposed: humility and altruism are opposed to ambition and egoism, a feature that is unique to

---

<sup>137</sup>The theme of true greatness in humility recurs esp. in Mt.5,19; 11,11; 12,6; Mk.9,33-37 par.; 12,38ff; Lk.20,46, and runs throughout the whole NT. On the primacy of service see also Mt.23,6-12; Lk.11,43; 14,7-11; 16,15; Jn.13,12ff; Rom.15,25,31; 16,1; 1 Cor.4,6-10; 16,15; 2 Cor.4,5; Col.1,7,25; 1 Pet.5,3.

Christianity.

The climaxing logia, v.45, served to support the instructions for the community leaders by pointing to the example of Jesus. The Mtan redactor removed any doubts in this respect by introducing this verse with ὡςπερ. The addition of the ransom-saying was made by pre-Mk to point out the supreme example of service and the limitlessness of an imitation of Jesus.<sup>138</sup> The title "Son of Man", which pre-Mk extended to include v.45a, enhanced the imitatio Iesu in as much as the former is a figure of full authority: Jesus, having full authority gave the example of service, not demanding to be served as would have been his right. For the redactors Jesus' redemptive death was the climax of his service. It is not impossible that the link of the two final logia was made in the light of the figure of the Suffering Servant. We have seen that Jesus' death was interpreted especially through the prism of the Song of the 'Ebed Yahweh: in Isa.52,13 Yahweh calls him 'Ἐβδ. The pre-Mkan redactor, who saw in Jesus the 'Ebed Yahweh, also saw it fit to join a logion where Jesus speaks of his mission as Servant (v.45a) with another where his mission of service is specified as that of the Suffering Servant, i.e. a soteriological service.<sup>139</sup>

By the combination of the figures of the SM and of the Servant, pre-Mk brought out (consciously or not) the well known schema of the just man's suffering and glorification. This schema is already present in Isa.52,13-53,12, and we find it also in the hymn of Phil.2,6-11. The SM is a glorious figure;

---

<sup>138</sup>Since the idea of imitating Jesus was well rooted in early Christianity (see 2 Cor.5,14; Eph.5,2,15; Jn.10,11,15, 17f; etc.) and only in Mk.10,45 par. Jesus is said to have presented himself for imitation, we have sufficient reason to think that the imitation-motif was not enunciated by Jesus. This is also observable in Mk.8,34 par.; 10,38f; Lk.14,27; Mt. 10,38. Schulz, Nachfolge, after studying this question concluded that "Die geistige Heimat der Imitatio Christi ist nicht Jesus selbst, sondern die Paränese der urchristlichen Verkündigung." (p.265)

<sup>139</sup>Barrett, "Background" 4, rejects any suggestion that Isa.53 served to link v.45a.b on the grounds that Ἐβδ is translated in the LXX by υἱός and never by δούλος. However, it should be borne in mind that it was the MT and not the LXX of Isa.53 that was being used and that in v.45a there is no question of terminology but of concepts. See also Roloff, "Anfänge" 62f.

the 'Ebed Yahweh of Suffering. Moreover, these two figures, personified in Jesus, indicate the beginning of the final aeon. Both, the SM and the Suffering Servant, were eschatological and messianic figures expected to come at the final times when a new relation to God, a definite new era, would begin.<sup>140</sup> Hence, the redactors looked at the whole of Jesus' life, back into his coming --and even pre-existence (SM!)-- and forward into the eschatological implications of the new era inaugurated with his coming.

G. The Meaning of 'Ερχεσθαι in Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28.

We have already pointed out that originally the logion of Mk.10,45a par. was an (ἐγὼ) εἰμί, and not an ἦλθον-logion. Pre-Mk may have received it as an ἦλθον-logion, which would have been an added element that helped the unification of v. 45a and v.45b under one common subject. The ransom-saying had been formulated as an ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου--saying by the early Church, which pre-Mk extended to include v.45a, thus soldering the two logia into one.

Without the SM as subject, ἦλθον + inf., in v.45a would have expressed primarily 'an intentionality: "my purpose/intention is ...." That that may also have been the original sense of the ransom-logion seems questionable to me.

With the SM as subject, ἦλθεν + inf. has undoubtedly, in both logia, the sense of "the SM came (to the world) in order to ...," i.e. it expresses at once a dynamic movement towards (come to men) and the causal intentionality for it. As an ecclesial product and an interpretamentum, ἦλθεν looks back at the totality of Jesus' life among men; v.45a looks at his ministry, and v.45b at the sum totum of it.

'Ερχεσθαι is closely related to the understanding of SM. Two aspects characterize the apocalyptic figure of the expected SM: (1) he is an eschatological figure, and (2) he is some-

<sup>140</sup>The Targum to Isa.52,13 calls the Servant שׁפּוּחַ; also in 53,10. Cf. likewise bSanh.98b; Midrash Rabba to Ruth 2,14. For the interpretations of this song see S.R. Driver-A.Neu-bauer, The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters, (reprint) New York 1969, and C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, Oxford 1956<sup>2</sup>, with an abundant bibliography.



one coming in glory and having full authority. The authority of Jesus is evident in our pericope: he speaks as one invested with authority to give instructions. The title SM here is used in lieu of and to underline the authoritative "I". Since the apocalyptic SM is a glorious figure, and most often an all-encompassing one, we can suspect a direct relation between Jesus' coming and the coming of the Kingdom of God. In fact, the SM and the Kingdom are both eschatological figures.<sup>141</sup>

Whether Jesus understood himself as the expected SM is most doubtful, but that the early Church did so is certain and, in this sense ἦλθεν κτλ. is a reflection of the Church on Jesus' career. Therefore ἔρχεσθαι expresses a retrospective theological understanding and implies the Incarnation in view of Redemption: his "pro-existence". The descent-ascent schema is visible. Jesus' pre-existence may be presupposed here on the basis of that of the figure of the SM (cf. 1 En.48,3.6; 46,1f; 49,2; 62,7; 4 Ezra 12,32; 13,26) and his role. By speaking of Jesus as the SM who came, his origin is understood to be from God himself, as a once-and-for-all event (note the aorists!) freely undertaken, having eschatological repercussions, and --what is more important-- fulfilling the messianic expectations in so far as the awaited SM has come.

The coming itself is stressed as much as the reason for it. The coming is underlined by the insertion of the title "Son of Man", and the reason that occasioned it is highlighted by the common denominator of both logia, viz. service.<sup>142</sup>

### CONCLUSION.

The pericope we have just studied at some length developed in two separate traditions: through the pre-Mkan to Mt/Mk,

<sup>141</sup>See Ashby, "The Coming" 362, and our remarks on the coming of Jesus and the coming of the Kingdom in p.302f. That Jesus' coming was understood in v.45 as an eschatological event is to be seen not only from the use of the title SM but also from the use made of the Song of the Suffering Servant. It is furthermore to be noticed that when reference is made to the Parousia it is almost invariably in terms of the apocalyptic SM.

<sup>142</sup>That v.45a and v.45b were meant to constitute a unity, where v.45b is the concrete culminating act of service, is to be seen in the fact that v.45b is also governed by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἦλθεν.

and through a proto-Lkan to Lk. The former placed it in a wider context of instructions for the early communities; the latter followed the Last Supper. In both it has the form of an instruction: it served a parenetic purpose, a community rule having in mind especially those in authority. The main point made is that of true greatness through humility: a Christian paradox!

The older form of the logion of Mk.10,45a was better preserved in Lk than in Mt/Mk. It was an "I" saying that spoke of Jesus' service. In the Lkan tradition it was formulated so as to fit the table-fellowship image; in the Mt/Mkan διακονεῖν took the sense of slave-like service. The ransom-logion, which primitively had a separate existence and was introduced into the pericope by pre-Mk, was unknown to Lk's source. To establish a better link between v.45a and v.45b, pre-Mk extended the subject of the latter to include the former. This also made the understanding of Jesus as the Suffering (v.45b) Servant (v.45a) transparent. What originally had been a kerygmatic-intended saying came to serve a parenetic purpose.

The ransom-saying, which primitively may have been formulated in the first person, is in no event retraceable to Jesus himself: the term λύτρον, the idea of universal substitution (ἀντὶ πολλῶν) and the form ἡλθον + inf. of purpose having as object his own death and are only understandable as ex eventu resurrectionis expressions that put in words the early Church's explanation of the scandal of the cross.

V.45b, by its SM formulation and its content, resembles the Passion predictions but has the form of a credal formula. It captured Jesus' pro-existence in a nutshell. The use of the term λύτρον refers us to the Hellenistic, Greek-speaking world. Yet, before that term was included in this logion we had an expression of the understanding of Jesus' death in the light of Isa.53, which it has as a background and whose terminology it echoes. It was conceived on Palestinian soil but given final shape elsewhere.

In the fact that "I am" of v.45a was absorbed by "the Son of Man came" we find an attestation of the early Church's tendency to portray Jesus as the Son of Man. A clear confirma-

tion of the fact that not all ἤλθον-sayings are Jesus' was also found, not only in the modification of v.45a, but already in the formation of v.45b. We are furthermore led to wonder whether in the last analysis the negative clause, as is the case in Mt.10,34 par., is not due to the early Church herself in an attempt to correct certain misconceptions about Jesus' ministry and his messiahship.

The verb ἔρχεσθαι, closely related to the titular SM, implies that he who came from God came bringing the definitive "reconciliation". His career was contrary to that expected from the SM and yet he is the authoritative envoy of God. ἔρχεσθαι has here its fullest sense of "to have come" and presupposes an understanding of his pre-existence. These implications behind ἤλθεν are all the more understandable as the Church product that it is.

- - - - -

## II. COME TO SEEK AND SAVE THE LOST: Lk.19,5-10.<sup>1</sup>

This pericope, strongly marked by Lk's vocabulary and style, has been preserved only by him. This may be due to the fact that he found it in his special source (L) and because of its poor-rich theme, which was of special interest to Lk.<sup>2</sup> It is preceded and followed by other pericopes which deal with the powerful/rich-helpless/poor theme,<sup>3</sup> and shows a relation by contrast with 18,35-43.<sup>4</sup> In many respects it resembles

<sup>1</sup>Besides the Commentaries, to my knowledge only the art. by K. Löning, "Ein Platz für die Verlorenen," BLEb 12(1971), 198-208, W.P. Loewe, "Towards an Interpretation of Lk 19:1-10," CBQ 36(1974), 321-331, deal with this pericope at some length but are not historico-critical studies.

<sup>2</sup>See the extensive study of H.J. Degenhardt, Lukas, Evangelist der Armen, Stuttgart 1965; surprisingly enough he does not study 19,1-10.

<sup>3</sup>18,18-23: the rich ruler; 18,24-27: difficulty for the rich to enter the Kingdom; 18,28-30: reward promised to those who leave all and follow Jesus; (18,31-34: 3d. prediction of the Passion --in Lk it serves here an ethical purpose, for Jesus' followers); 18,35-43: the blind beggar; 19,11-26: Parable of Talents --using well the goods entrusted.

<sup>4</sup>The contrast between the two men in Jericho, the blind-beggar and the rich Zachaeus who seeks to see Jesus, is hardly accidental:

///

that of the call and meal in Levi's house,<sup>5</sup> and presents a similar outlook: conversion, translated by detachment, as a fundamental condition for an intimate relation with Jesus.

Luke has placed the story of the cure of the blind beggar at the entrance of Jesus to Jericho, not at his departure as Mk (10,46) and Mt (20,29) have it. This was done intentionally, probably to establish a closer link with the story of Zacchaeus.<sup>6</sup> It constitutes the last soteriologically intended relation of Jesus with any particular individual before going to Jerusalem, to the cross (cf. v.11). This story marks the end of his missionary activity, and it is the last time that Jesus calls a Jew to salvation. Lk.18,35-19,27, which frame our pericope,<sup>7</sup> clearly indicate that here Lk intends to bring out Jesus' messiahship: in 18,38.39 the beggar calls Jesus "son of David" (contrast with v.37!), and the Parable of the Ten Pounds is framed with allusions to Jesus' kingship (19,12.27: only in Lk!) which is rejected by his people (v.14, only in Lk!).

#### A. Literary Criticism.

We shall concentrate our attention on v.5-10, which constitute the core of the story and lead directly to our logion.<sup>8</sup>

/// a) contrasts:

18,35: an unknown (τις) beggar (ἐπαλιῶν is absent in the par.!) he is blind;	19,2: Zacchaeus is wealthy (his name is underlined) he seeks to see Jesus;
36f: he did not know Jesus was passing;	3: he knew Jesus was passing;
38: he cries for mercy;	4: he is silent, curious;
41: he asks: ἵνα ἀναβλέψω	5: ὁ ἀναβλέψας, tells Zac...
39: the crowds rebuke him;	7: all murmur vs. Jesus;
b) similarity:	
42b: πίστις σέσωκέν σε	9c: σωτηρίᾳ came because

"also he (!) is a son of Abraham".

We can already suspect that "son of Abraham" = a man of faith.

<sup>5</sup>Bultmann, ST 34, considers it a variant of Mk.2,15ff.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. n.4 above. The two pericopes together suggest a parallelism with Jesus' entrance to Jerusalem. Both are marked by a recognition of his messiahship; he is welcomed as Messiah (18,37ff; 19,37f) but not all approve of him (19,7.39).

<sup>7</sup>It is noteworthy that 18,31-34 (3d Passion prediction) and 19,28-38 (triumphal entry to Jerusalem) are closely related. They antithetically paint Jerusalem, i.e. official Judaism, as the conscious rejectors of the Messiah. Note in 18,31 the reference to accomplishment of prophecy, and in 19,39 the opposition between "some of the Pharisees from among the crowd (ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου)" and "your disciples" (cf. v.37b!).

<sup>8</sup>For a literary analysis of v.1-4 see Boismard, Synopse 322.

As a whole, the story constitutes a rather well built unit, with the exception of v.8 which breaks the flow of the narrative and brings about an inconsistency in v.9 (cf. *infra*). This indicates that Lk used a written source. The great number of Lkan terms and expressions make it extremely difficult to recover the text of his source. One has the impression that Lk has completely reworked his source. However, some elements can be singled out as being probably due to RLk's hand.

1. The Encounter: v.5-7. In v.5 the temporal conj. ὡς (=when) the use of ἐπὶ + acc., εἶπεν πρὸς + acc. instead of a dative, may be due to RLk.<sup>9</sup> Similarly the soteriological σήμερον, the actualized kairos of the visitation,<sup>10</sup> which is underlined by δεῖ and σπεύσας, indicating the urgency of the moment, are most probably due to the final redactor;<sup>11</sup> σήμερον echoes v.9 and may be here in view of the latter in the same manner as σπεύσας is anticipatory of the same in v.6.

It is not at all impossible that (καὶ) ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν χαίρων, in v.6, may be due to RLk.<sup>12</sup> It is noteworthy that Lk several times presents similar encounters with the option of accepting or rejecting Christ, as in 1,14; 2,10-20; 4,24; 7,6-9.30; etc.

In v.7 one is puzzled by the indefinite πάντες and the reference to Zacchaeus as a ἁμαρτωλὸς ἀνὴρ. Both may be due to Lk. Πάντες may stand in place of ὄχλος and refer to those of v.3b, where they also had a negative role for they prevented Zacchaeus from seeing Jesus. That Zacchaeus is called a ἁμαρτωλὸς ἀνὴρ, while in v.2 he is presented simply as an ἀρχιτελώνης, is not strange. It's intent is to remind Gentile Christians that, in the eyes of the Jews a tax-collector was classed as a sinner, a distinction no longer remembered in Lk's community (see Mk.2,15b.16, in c.I, p.30f). We may assume that

<sup>9</sup>η conj. occurs 2/0/26+34, and ἐπὶ + acc. 68/35/99+107 times (Morgenthaler); εἶπεν πρὸς + acc. 0/1/19; see Hawkins, HS 49.

<sup>10</sup>Σήμερον is used in a soteriological sense in 2,11; 3,22 (D,it); 4,21; 5,26; 13,32b.33a; 23,43, and again in 19,9. Never in Mk and Mt. On this see Flender, St Luke 151f.

<sup>11</sup>Δεῖ occurs 8/6/18+24 times; σπεύσας, a graphic part. in lieu of a coordinate is quite Lkan: 0/0/3+2.

<sup>12</sup>Again in 10,38 and Acts 17,7; ὑποδέχομαι is never in Mk and Mt. Χαίρειν, used graphically, indicates as in 1,14.28; 10,20; 13,17; 15,32; 19,37, a joy due to the nearness of salvation.

Lk's source read ἀρχιτελώνης.<sup>13</sup> We already encountered a similar change in 5,30 par. It would seem that v.7 has been reshaped by Lk, inspired by 5,30, not only because at the moment of objecting to Jesus' behavior we have the object referred to as ἁμαρτωλός, but in both cases Lk mentions that they (δι)εγόγγυζον λέγοντες;<sup>14</sup> his source might have simply read ἔλεγον.

2. Conversion: v.8. We have already indicated that v.8 is due to RLk. This fact can be divined in the following observations: (1) v.8 breaks the flow of the story: to the objection raised against Jesus' behavior, the response given in v.9 is expected to come at once; (2) the response of Jesus in v.9 is provoked by Zacchaeus' acceptance of Jesus into his οἶκος and not because of the declaration of v.8; (3) v.9 is not addressed to Zacchaeus but to the objectors; and (4) the words of Zacchaeus are totally unexpected, they respond to no remark that Jesus might have made about his riches and, in fact, there is no reaction to Zacchaeus' short discourse. It should also be noted that only in v.8 is Jesus referred to as κύριος, and that the theme as well as the vocabulary are Lkan.<sup>15</sup> Finally, v.8 introduces a new, ancillary theme with a clear ethical view, and not soteriological as the rest of the story. It has a didactic purpose in mind.<sup>16</sup>

3. The Assurance of Salvation: v.9. By trying to integrate v.8 into the story, Lk also brought about a striking inconsistency in v.9. While v.9a introduces Jesus' speech as addressed to Zacchaeus (εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, as in v.5!),<sup>17</sup> the statement

<sup>13</sup>That ἁμαρτωλός is due to Lk is further confirmed by the addition of ἀνῆκε, a term he uses frequently (8/4/27+101!).

<sup>14</sup>Διαγογγύζω reccurs only in Lk.15,2 (see also 5,30). It is known that Lk frequently uses a descriptive participle with another verb of speech.

<sup>15</sup>Concerning the vocabulary we observe that (1) σταθεῖς is used again only in Lk.18,11.40 and Acts 2,14; 5,20; 11,13; 17,22; 25,18; 27,21 --for Grundmann, Lk 358, it is Lk's. (2) εἶπεν πρὸς (cf. v.5) is quite Lkan, as is the use of κύριος for the historical Jesus. (3) τὰ ὑπαρχόντα 3/0/8 (verb: 0/0/7+24); πτωχός 5/5/10; συκοφαντέω only again in Lk.3,14.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Leaney, Lk 241; Bultmann, ST 33f, and Löning, "Ein Platz" 201.

<sup>17</sup>Klostermann, Lk 185, thinks that πρὸς αὐτόν means "concerning him," but to express this πρὸς αὐτόν is used; cf. Bultmann, ST 33. Lagrange, Lk 489, trying to defend the unity of the narrative suggests that one understand πρὸς αὐτόν as in ///

itself uses the 3d person sing., referring to Zacchaeus (τούτῳ instead of σοι<sup>18</sup> and αὐτός), and addresses itself evidently to the objectors of v.7. This inconsistency reveals two things: πρὸς αὐτόν in v.9a is due to RLk<sup>19</sup> in an attempt to harmonize v.8 with the statement of v.9, and the statement itself --certainly part of it,-- was already present in his source. It is interesting to observe that, while the sentences of v.1-7 are always connected by καί, in v.8 and v.9a the connective δέ is used instead.<sup>20</sup>

The logion of v.9 is constituted by two sayings (v.9a.b) that had separate origins. This can be observed in the fact v.9a refers to the whole house of Zacchaeus, and v.9b points only to Zacchaeus, justifying v.9a on the basis that Zacchaeus is a "son of Abraham". Let us take a closer look at these.

It is not impossible that the adverb σήμερον in v.9a, as in v.5 (q.v.), is due to Lk himself. The theme of σωτηρία occurs almost exclusively in Lk.<sup>21</sup> The use of οἶκος in the sense of "household", "family", is frequent in Lk's writings;<sup>22</sup> and so is the Semitic-like ἐγένετο.<sup>23</sup> These observations indicate that v.9a is due either to pre-Lk (note the frequency with which the various terms occur in Lk.1-2) or to the final redactor. The former is more probable on account of the dissonance between αὐτόν and τούτῳ, and v.8 and v.9a are due to RLk.

In the saying of v.9b the explicative καθότι is an addition made by Lk in order to link v.9a and v.9b.<sup>24</sup> Even though the expression καὶ αὐτός is frequently used in Lk,<sup>25</sup> and the ex-

/// Mk.12,12, i.e. as addressed to those present --but see Mk. 12,12! πρὸς αὐτούς (cf. also v.5, where εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν unquestionably refers to Zacchaeus since he is named). For Löning, "Ein Platz" 201, it is superfluous. It is noteworthy that R has πρὸς αὐτός, similarly the old Latin versions a,b,c,ff<sup>2</sup>,i,l, s, read "ad illos".

<sup>18</sup>Admittedly v.9a can be thought as said to Zacchaeus with τούτῳ acting as a demonstrative of nearness, but is awkward.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. n.9 above; εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν in v.5 is Lk's.

<sup>20</sup>This was already observed by Boismard, Synopse 322.

<sup>21</sup>Cf. 1,69.71.77; Acts 4,12; 7,25; 13,26.47; 16,17; 27,34. Only in Lk is Jesus called σωτήρ: 1,47; 2,11(!); Acts 5,21; 13,23.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. 1,27.33.69; 2,4; 10,5; etc. and Hawkins, HS 44.

<sup>23</sup>It occurs 13/16/71+52 times.

<sup>24</sup>Used only in Lk.1,7; Acts 2,24.45; 4,35; 17,31.

<sup>25</sup>Occurs 4/5/41+8; cf. Hawkins, HS 41f, Zerwick, Gk §150.

pression υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ resembles that of 13,16 (Θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ), it is reasonable to assert that this saying constituted the original ending of the story. This becomes all the more clear if we observe that Zacchaeus had been rejected as a ἁμαρτωλός because of his profession, and that Jesus replies to his objectors. Jesus contradicts their traditions by going back to God's will, free from the Rabbinic interpretations and narrowings, as he often does in the controversy stories. For him Zacchaeus is a Jew and that by itself justifies his "scandalous" behavior. This saying responds in full the objection; it is a short, brisk answer with no added explanations. The deduction of its implications are left to his audience (as elsewhere, eg. in Mk.2,17a par. [q.v.]; 2,27; etc.). Here we see reflected a period when Jesus' mission was understood to have been exclusively for the Jews, and therefore had a Judeo-Christian "setting in life" (note the καὶ αὐτός!).<sup>26</sup>

Concerning the sayings of v.9 we can therefore assume that v.9b constituted the original answer, to which v.9a was later added.<sup>27</sup>

4. The ἦλθον Logion: v.10. The final logion, which alludes to Ezek.34,16, provides the fundamental reason for Jesus' behavior. With the majority of scholars, we can safely consider this logion to have been introduced by RLk. This conclusion is warranted by the following observations: (1) there exist several logia which resemble v.10 and express a stereotyped post-Paschal synthesis of Jesus' mission and which is placed on Jesus' lips for a didactic purpose. It is found in a slightly different form in Lk.9,56a and in Mt.18,11, both almost unanimously rejected on textual grounds (see p.180-192), as well as in Lk.5,32/Mk.2,17b. It is the reference in Jn.3,17 (οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνη

<sup>26</sup>It must also be mentioned that the introduction and the saying of v.9a seem to be due to two different hands: noticeable is the unexpected use of the 3d person after the introduction εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν: one would expect the 2d person to follow (ὅτι is recitative). The introduction is probably RLk's.

<sup>27</sup>Thus also Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte* II, 231f; see also Dupont, *Beatitudes* III, 161f. Higgins, *Jesus* 76, thinks it ended with v.9a. Leaney, *Lk* 241f, rightly indicated that v.9b could not have been due to RLk because for him salvation was now addressed especially to the Gentiles.



τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ), and 1 Tim. 1, 15b (Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σωσαι) which strengthen our suspicion that v. 10 is a post-Paschal logion. (2) The theme of seeking the lost is most frequent in Lk; suffice it to recall his grouping of three parables (even if of pre-Lukan origin) on this theme in c. 15. (3) Only Lk has preserved an explicit reference to Ezek. 34, 16, in 15, 4. If we consider the logion within its present context we further observe that (4) we have two reasons given for the statement of v. 9a, viz. v. 9b, "because he is also a son of Abraham", and v. 10, ἦλθεν γὰρ .... The two are only loosely related, and neither follows from the other. The former is a statement of fact, the latter a general fundamental reason for Jesus' behavior which is equally applicable in other contexts (cf. (1) above). (5) With the explicative γὰρ<sup>28</sup> v. 10 intends to give a Christological/Messianic basis for the logion of v. 9; it amplifies and clarifies the designation υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ: he is the one who no longer is ἀπολωλός. While for Ezekiel the ἀπολωλός is the Chosen People in the diaspora, the Evangelist understood it as the one in need of conversion (cf. 15, 6f. 9f. 24. 32). (6) The logion of v. 10 turns our attention from Zacchaeus to Jesus, and adds nothing to the story itself which is concerned with the former. Finally, (7) the last logion could have had an independent existence, which is not the case for that of v. 9 which requires a context like the present one. The ἦλθεν-saying is here due more to the general tenor of the narrative than to its composing elements.

If the ἦλθεν-saying had been the original response of Jesus, then the inconsistencies of v. 9 would hardly have arisen. It is precisely these inconsistencies that strengthen our assumption that it was the logion of v. 9 that was already present in Lk's source and that Lk added v. 10, probably because he considered v. 9 to be insufficient and narrow as an answer given by Jesus. With T.W. Manson we can say that v. 10 is "a saying with no place to lay its head;"<sup>29</sup> its present position is

<sup>28</sup>Syr<sup>s,c</sup> read καὶ ὅτι ἦλθεν κτλ. The text of von Soden shows the separation of these logia by a period before ἦλθεν.

<sup>29</sup>Teaching 224f; see also Schmid, Lk 287.

artificial.<sup>30</sup>

The fact that the logion of v.10 was introduced here by Lk does not necessarily mean that it is due to him. Being the only "the Son of Man came"-saying in Lk that refers to Jesus' earthly career and which echoes Ezek.34,16, it is almost certainly pre-Lkan in origin,<sup>31</sup> however reshaped by Lk.

The term (καὶ) σωσαι is almost certainly due to Lk's pen. It is absent in the text that apparently inspired it, viz. Ezek.34,16, as well as in the parables of c.15 (pre-Lkan!) where the same theme is treated.<sup>32</sup> It appears in the late reflections of Jn.3,17 and 1 Tim.1,15b: here is no longer a question of "seeking" but only of "saving". It may be explained as a Lkan addition by the fact that the concept of σωτηρία/σώζειν is quite frequent in Lk<sup>33</sup> and that here καὶ σωσαι is probably attracted by the reference to σωτηρία in v.9a.<sup>34</sup> The term σωσαι denotes a theological reflection: it is only after Jesus' death and resurrection that it became obvious that he had come for the purpose of saving mankind (τὸ ὁπολῶ-λός). No other "lucanisms" are discernible.

#### B. Form and Formative Factors.

For M. Dibelius this story is a "personal legend" which may have been used in preaching as an example of forgiveness.<sup>35</sup> R. Bultmann classed it among the "Biographical apophthegms."<sup>36</sup> According to K. Löning we have to do with a "legend" serving a didactic purpose.<sup>37</sup> V.10 is a mission-saying with a soteriolo-

<sup>30</sup>For Klostermann, Lk 184, it was most probably already in the original text.

<sup>31</sup>Tödt, SM 133: because this is the only text on the earthly mission of the SM Lk may have received it from tradition. For Hahn, Hoheitstitel 89, even if it were redactional, it may have its origin in L.

<sup>32</sup>Also witnessed by the Gospel of the Traditions of Matthias (early 2d cent.), reported by Clem. Alex. in Strom. IV, vi.209: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔλθων σήμερον τὸ ὁπολῶλός εἶδεν.

<sup>33</sup>Σώζειν in the soteriological sense, is found in 7,15; 8,12.48.50; 9,24.56; 13,23; 17,19; 18,26.42.

<sup>34</sup>Hahn, op.cit. 45 n.6. According to Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 231, v.9a and v.10 existed together, which is not impossible. One may wonder whether καὶ σωσαι is epexegetic, precisising the purpose of ζητῆσαι.

<sup>35</sup>Tradition 118, 131. But there is no question of forgiveness here, rather conversion is the point.

<sup>36</sup>ST 33f.

<sup>37</sup>"Ein Platz" 207.

gical content, serving a kerygmatic purpose. The didactic value of this story may account for its preservation and expansion by Lk. While the pre-Lkan form of this pericope showed an interest as much on the soteriological initiative of Christ as on the attitude necessary for conversion (viz. receptivity, openness) and its importance for salvation, RLk precises this attitude as detachment (v.8)<sup>38</sup> and underlines Christ's initiative by adding v.10.

# 1. Form of the Pericope.

With its rather long narrative section (v.1-6), the pre-Lkan text had the form of a mild conflict story: a revolutionary action of Jesus provokes criticism (v.7) and a response by him follows (v.9b). The final redactor introduced the paradigmatic element of detachment (v.8) and the soteriological motivation (v.10).

The story of Zacchaeus shows a number of resemblances with that of Levi (Mk.2,14-17 par.):

-in both Jesus is going through a certain place: *παρεῖ τὴν θάλασσαν/διήρχετο τὴν Ἱερριῶ* ;

-where there is a (*ἀρχι*)τελώνης, whose name (*ὀνόματι*) is given;

-Jesus goes out of his way and addresses an invitation to him: *εἶπεν* + an imperative;

-which receives a positive compliance; the call and the acceptance are described by the same terms:

*ἀκολουθεῖ μοι* - *καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ*  
*σπεύσας κατὰβηθι* - *καὶ σπεύσας κατέβη*

-then Jesus enters in the house,

-which then brings about the objection, which is not addressed directly to Jesus himself but is murmured: (*δι*)*εγόγγυζον*, because the host is a *ἁμαρτωλός* in their eyes;

-Jesus' response follows, justifying his behavior;

-an *ἦλθον*-saying is appended, concerning Jesus' mission to call/seek the *ἁμαρτωλούς/ἀπολωλός* to salvation.

These similarities led R. Bultmann to consider Lk.19,1-10 to be "manifestly imaginary, an extended version of Mk.2<sup>14</sup> which, combined with vv.15-17 gave rise to this story."<sup>39</sup> The

<sup>38</sup>Cf. also 5,28; 6,29b-30.34; 9,3ff.25; 10,4a.38-42; 12,33f; 14,13f.33; 18,28ff; 21,1-4. It contrasts with the attitude of attachment typical of the rich, cf. 6,24ff; 12,13-21; 16,13ff.19-31; 18,18-30.

<sup>39</sup>ST 34.

question of probable historicity of this account is not going to detain us since it is unimportant to our main subject, even though its setting gives it a degree of historical probability. Let us turn our attention to the logion of v.10.

## 2. The ἦλθεν-saying: its Earliest Form.

The ἦλθεν-saying is to be found in various forms in Lk. 5,32 par; 9,56a; in Mt.15,24; 18,11, as well as in Jn.3,17 and 1 Tim.1,15b. From here one may be tempted to conclude that it comprises an important and quite ancient tradition. Of these, Mt.18,11 is a copy of Lk.19,10 --excluding καὶ σῶσαι. Lk.9,56a, as will be hopefully shown below; is a step earlier than Lk. 19,10. Jn.3,17 and 1 Tim.1,15b are, as already mentioned, late kerygmaticized formulations.

### a. The Logia in Lk.19,10 and Mk.2,17b par.

Let us take a closer look at our logion comparing it with that of Mk.2,17b par.

<u>Mk.2,17b par.</u>	<u>Lk.19,10</u>
οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.	ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

The two logia are thematically identical: the same statement is made in different words.

The following correspondences are most illuminating: (1) while in Mk we have an ἦλθον-saying (the only one in Mk!), in Lk we have an ἦλθεν SM-saying. Given that the tendency was to change the former into the latter (see Mk.10,45!), if the same logion lay at the basis of these, or if one used the other, then that of Lk would be posterior. (2) In Mk the expression καὶ σῶσαι is absent, while καλέσαι and ζητῆσαι correspond to each other; both have as purpose the invitation to conversion. We may have here an added evidence for the contention that καὶ σῶσαι was added later to the logion in Lk. It is also to be noted that Lk likewise added an explicative εἰς μετάνοιαν to the logion of Mk.2,17b. (3) It was already indicated when we studied Mk.2,17 that ἁμαρτωλούς belonged to the primitive form of the logion. Lk's τὸ ἀπολωλός is taken most probably directly from Ezek.34,16a and hence is a later

reflection. Finally, (4) the polemic οὐκ - clause of Mk is absent in Lk. It was unnecessary on account of the justification already found in v.9b. While Mk.2,17b has a polemic tone, Lk. 19,10, in an exclusively positive and calm tone, summarizes the σωτήρ's loving concern for "the lost ones".

May we therefore conclude that Lk.19,10 represents a later adapted use of the logion in Mk.2,17b? The correspondences above indicated and also the similarities in context suggest such a re-use. However, we must also reckon with the fact that the logion of Lk actually has Ezek.34,16 at its basis, which is not the case for Mk.2,17b, but is so for Mt.15,24. We must therefore compare Lk.19,10 with Mt.15,24 before an answer may be given to our question.

b. The Logia in Lk.19,10 and Mt.15,24.

The logion in Mt.15,24 is in itself narrow in perspective (but see our analysis in c.VI, p.315ff), more than Lk.19,10.

<u>Mt.15,24</u>	<u>Lk.19,10</u>	<u>Ezek.34,15a.16a</u>
<u>ἀπεστάλην</u>	<u>ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.</u>	<u>ἐγὼ βοσκήσω</u>
<u>εἰς τὰ πρόβατα</u>	<u>ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι</u>	<u>τὰ πρόβατά μου</u>
<u>τὰ ἀπολωλότα</u>	<u>τὸ ἀπολωλός.</u>	<u>....</u>
<u>οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.</u>		<u>τὸ ἀπολωλὸς</u>
		<u>ζητήσω....</u>

In Mt the verb ἀπεστάλην is simpler (1st person) than ἦλθεν SM, and, in a text that alludes to Ezek.34, is reminiscent of the sending of the prophet. It contrasts with the heavy ἦλθεν SM in that the latter carries the underlying implications of a self-possession of divine authority. Lk's logion indicates a clear understanding of Jesus' coming as having inaugurated the eschatological momentum: it is the Son of Man who came. While Mt.15,24 preserves the nationalistic tone of Ezek.34, Lk's changes this: there is no reference to Israel.<sup>40</sup>

The reference to Jesus as Son of Man may have been already in the pre-Lkan form of this logion.<sup>41</sup> It is the only

<sup>40</sup>It is noteworthy that Lk does not contain the pericope about the Canaanean woman; indeed none of the two logia of nationalistic outlook, viz. Mt.10,6 and 15,24. One may wonder whether these were known in the Lkan tradition, especially if that of Mt.15,24 was changed in form in the light of the Easter-event, to constitute that of Lk.19,10.

<sup>41</sup>Thus maintained by Colpe, TDNT VIII, 453: it was added before Lk received it, possibly by pre-Lk.

occasion in Lk wherein we find this term applied to the earthly mission of Jesus. A more primitive form, as seen in Mt.15, 24, may have been in the first person given that the tendency was to introduce, not to eliminate, "Son of Man". One has, therefore, the impression that the logion in Lk is modelled on that in Mt.15,24.<sup>42</sup> Since καὶ σῶσαι is almost certainly due to RLk, the more primitive form of our logion, closer to Ezek.34, 16, might have been ἦλθον (or ἀπεστάλην) ζητῆσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.<sup>43</sup>

c. The "Son of Man" and the Shepherd Figure.

In the logion of v.10, which alludes to Ezek.34,16, the term Son of Man used in connection with the figure of the shepherd, may be an indication of their identification. Even though we possess no evidence clearly pointing to such an association of concepts, it is not impossible if the figure of the SM was understood in the early Church as being the Messiah-king.<sup>44</sup> In the OT the kings are often pictured as shepherds, and so is Yahweh especially in Ezek. (34,10-16.23ff; 37,24)<sup>45</sup> and Zech. (10,3.8; 11,4-17; 13,7ff).<sup>46</sup> Interesting is 1 En.90,14:

I saw till that man,<sup>47</sup> who wrote down the names of the shepherds (and) carried up into the presence of the Lord of the sheep came and helped it and showed it everything: he had come down for the help of the ram.

<sup>42</sup>Cf. Jeremias, "Schicht" 166. Bultmann, ST 34, contending that it is inspired on Mk.2,17 overlooks Mt.15,24. See further Higgins, Jesus 77.

<sup>43</sup>The logion Lk.19,10 in its earliest form could have been a re-reading of Mk.2,17b par. in terms of Ezek.34, independently of Mt.15,24. The various possibilities must remain open for lack of conclusive evidence.

<sup>44</sup>Cf. 2 Sam.24,17; 1 Kgs.22,17/2 Chr.18,16; Judit 11,19; Mic.5,4b.5a; Jer.2,8; 10,21; 23,1f.4; 27,6.44(LXX); 29,19(LXX). It is known that the Mesopotamian, Assyrian, and Babylonian kings were pictured as shepherds of their people and, in texts explicitly use this picture; it is equivalent to the Hebrew expression "the savior of his people"; cf. Mowinckel, He That Cometh 47.

<sup>45</sup>For Ezek. the shepherd is Yahweh, who will deal with his sheep differently from the manner by which the kings did (34, 1-10) and who will reign through his Messiah. The lost sheep are his chosen people scattered in the diaspora (v.12f).

<sup>46</sup>Cf. CD 19,8f (=Zech.13,7); further Isa.40,11; 63,11; Jer.23,3.5(!); Sir.18,13b.

<sup>47</sup>According to Charles, in a n. to the text, it is Michael. For T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, London 1945, 28f, it is a Messianic figure. See further D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, London 1964, 343f.

In 1 En.89 God is constantly referred to as "the Lord of the sheep". Evidently these texts do not establish a connection between the figures of the SM and of the shepherd. However, a relation may be clearer when we remember that Jesus is reported to have spoken of himself as a shepherd.<sup>48</sup>

Interesting is the identification between Son of Man, shepherd, and king in Mt.25,31ff: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory... before him shall be gathered all nations and he shall separate them one from the other, as a shepherd separates his sheep from the goats.... Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand...." We should also point out that the figure of the Suffering Servant in Isa.53 is pictured as a sheep led to the slaughter (v.7) for the benefit of the sheep (v.6). It is well known that the early Church saw a link between the SM and the Suffering Servant, as is evidenced by the Passion predictions (see further Mk.10,45b).

If I am correct, and an association between the figures of the SM and of the shepherd, inspired by Ezek.34, lies at the root of the term Son of Man here, then the latter is an addition, the "setting in life" of this logion is to be sought in a Judeo-Christian milieu, and it is not "an Hellenistic product" as R. Bultmann holds.<sup>49</sup>

d. The Formative Cradle. The "setting in life" of the story preserved at the beginnings of the particular Lkan tradition, is to be sought in a community composed mostly of Judeo-Christians,<sup>50</sup> as the details and especially the saying of v.9b reveal. In view of v.10, a dispute (v.7) about the re-admittance of members of the community who had fallen away (τὸ ἀπολωλός),<sup>51</sup> possibly because of their wealthy background (additions in v. 2a, and v.8), constituted the latest "setting in life" of this pericope which, as we already mentioned, served a didactic purpose. The change from ἀρχιτελώνης (v.2) to ἀματωλός (v.7),

<sup>48</sup>Cf. Mt.26,31(=Zech.13,71)/Mk.14,27; Jn.10,1-8; further Mt.2,6; 9,36 par.; Hebr.13,30; 1 Pet.3,25; and esp. Lk.15,1-7.

<sup>49</sup>St 105. For Hahn, Hoheitstitel 45, it comes from a Hellenistic-Judeo-Christian milieu, which is quite plausible.

<sup>50</sup>Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 232. Löning, "Ein Platz" 207, narrows it down to a Palestinian milieu.

<sup>51</sup>Τὸ ἀπολωλός implies a previous belonging to and a subsequent loss; one does not lose what one did not have.

suggests a community composed mostly of Christians of Gentile origin, as was the case in 5,30ff.

### C. The Authenticity of the Logion Lk.19,10.

From our foregoing discussions it can be divined that the probability of authenticity of Lk.19,10 is rather slim, all the more so for its present form.<sup>52</sup> We must, however, study this question more attentively, considering the presumed primitive form of our logion (ἦλθον [or ἀπεστάλην?] ζητῆσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός) in the light of the most helpful authenticating criteria.

1. The Criterion of Multiple Attestation. It was already mentioned that our logion is found in varied forms in Lk.5,32 par; 9,56a; Mt.18,11; 15,24; Jn.3,17, and 1 Tim.1,15b. It is echoed in the parables of Lk.15,1-10. That is, we find witnesses to our logion in other contexts and literary forms, which allows us to think that it is not impossible that Jesus could have at some time made such a reference to his missionary career.

2. The Criterion of Language. The terminology used is most probably borrowed from Ezek.34,16a --the vocabulary not being markedly Lkan, even if the theme is. It is not difficult to think of a possible Semitic substratum such as: אֵת (אֲשֶׁת־חַיִּים) לְכַבֵּד. <sup>53</sup> This would suggest a very ancient origin of our logion, possibly Palestinian. In view of its simplicity, it could have been uttered by Jesus; it is however its content and underlying implications when approached to Ezek.34 that cast a shadow of doubt on its authenticity.

3. The Criterion of Coherence. There is no doubt that our logion is wholly coherent with Jesus' overall teaching and particularly his continuous invitation to conversion. The expression τὸ ἀπολωλός is elsewhere used to refer to the Jews gone astray (thus in Mt.10,6 and 15,24), who do not recognize God's

<sup>52</sup>Thus Tödt, Son of Man 134; Bultmann, ST 105; Higgins, Jesus 77; H. Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, London 1969, 134: "it is a generalized interpretation by the community". E. Ashby, "The Coming" 361, considers it "unlikely that the Early Church would have invented sayings of this kind" because there are so few of them and it is a difficult saying in that it speaks of Jesus as Son of Man.

<sup>53</sup>The Hebrew would run thus: בָּאתִי (נְשִׁלְחָתִי) לְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת-הַנֶּלֶךְ.



ultimate will.<sup>54</sup> In Lk.15,4.6.24.32 it has a more theological and universalistic outlook: it is God who seeks, who awaits the return of the lost, without distinction. Given the fact that the logion Lk.19,10 was introduced following a designation of "son of Abraham" and that it alludes to Ezek.34,16a where τὸ ἀπολωλός refers to the Jews, we may assume that that is the original sense of the expression here. That is what a Jew would understand by this term, whether Lk intended it so or not. The fact that τὸ ἀπολωλός, outside of the parables of c.15, does not occur again in Lk/Acts may well be an added indication of an origin other than Lk. It does not occur again in the NT, aside from the references given above.

4. The Criterion of Distinctiveness. More important than the previous considerations is to inquire whether the only source of this logion could be the early Church --or Jesus. There are several indications that suggest an origin in the Church. First the parables of Lk.15 refer to God's, not directly Jesus' concern for the lost ones. The fact that here it is Jesus who seeks them suggests an identification between Jesus and God. Second, the citation of Ezek.34 which constitutes the background --even linguistically-- of our logion, is what "the Lord God says" (v.11). This suggests that in the logion Lk.19,10 there is an appropriation by Jesus of what Yahweh had said of his salvific purpose. We find again an identification Jesus-God! These two observations lead one to think that it is quite plausible that our logion, even in its earliest form, was coined by the early Church. A Church reflection may lie at the basis of this logion; it may well be an explicitation of Jesus' messiahship: he is the shepherd of Israel; in him came the shepherd Yahweh --announced in Ezek.34 and later writings.

In view of the above established as well as previous considerations, it seems more probable that the present logion, in any of its forms, is a prophetic formulation due to the early Church, than that it is ipsissima vox (or even verba)

---

<sup>54</sup>It is noteworthy that, even though Lk has the pericopes wherein these logia occur, he does not have the logia themselves --most probably because he found them inconvenient to his universalistic-ecclesiological outlook. I have omitted Mt.18,11 for it is an interpolated duplication of Lk.19,10 (see our discussion in p.191ff.).

Iesu. However, even if one would be inclined to consider this logion as a product of the Church's reflection, it is not totally ruled out that in its earliest simple form, Jesus could have uttered such a saying unpretentiously as an expression of his missionary zeal.

The expression τὸ ἀπολωλός and the use of Ezek.34 places us in a Jewish milieu, possibly Palestinian: we are not far from Jesus. We sense the still restrictive concept of salvation as addressed quasi-exclusively to the Jews, as it was already in Ezek.34; such an outlook is hardly what the later community would have contemplated. In fact, the logion was broadened with the change to SM and the addition of σωσαι, which had for effect to render the reminiscence of Ezek.34 remote. Thus, even if our logion did not originate in Jesus' lips, it was put there very early.

#### D. The Redactor's Perspective.

The additions which, from our literary analysis of the pericope, could almost certainly be assigned to the final redactor, indicate a definite concern with the problem "riches-salvation".<sup>55</sup> This problem, which is touched upon more frequently in Lk than in any other gospel,<sup>56</sup> is here attested by the detail added in v.2a that Zacchaeus was πλούσιος and especially by the declaration in v.8. RLk wants to indicate, in a pericope serving a didactic purpose, that attachment to one's riches is an obstacle that separates man from God and that makes any intimate relation with him difficult.<sup>57</sup>

It is particularly in v.8 that Lk reveals his thinking: the reference to Jesus as κύριος (twice!), and the offer to make restitution and share his goods with others, indicate that the establishment of a positive relation between Zacchaeus

---

<sup>55</sup>While originally Zacchaeus' salvation was directly related to his faith (v.9b), for Lk he was lost (ἀπολωλός) because of his concern with riches (v.2a.8).

<sup>56</sup>Cf. 6,24; 11,42; c.12; c.13; 14,7-14; 16,19-31; c.21; all found only in Lk.

<sup>57</sup>The general context of the pericope also indicates this theological perspective. Noteworthy are also the number of times that Lk inserts a note on the importance of detachment, for instance in 3,11; 6,29b-30.34; 5,28; 7,5; 8,3; 9,57-61; 10,4.25-42; etc.

and Jesus, between the rich and Christ, has now been made possible. The offer to make restitution and to share his goods with the poor are tangible signs of Zacchaeus' conversion (note the solemn ἰδοῦ); the resulting σωτηρία is confirmed in the affirmation of v.9a. In contrast with the story of the rich young man, in 18,18-30 par., there is no question in our story of abandoning one's riches. What matters and is decisive is conversion, which is prepared by the attitude of receptivity (v.6) and is translated by sharing with the needy (v.8b)<sup>58</sup> --not just restitution.<sup>59</sup>

While in the pre-Lukan account σωτηρία is seen as coming with Jesus' εἰσῆλθεν καταλῦσαι (same perspective as in Mk.2, 15ff) which in turn is only possible if one heeds to his call (v.5cd.6), in the account bequeathed to us by Lk detachment-faith-salvation are seen as interrelated. In this way Lk contrasts Zacchaeus' attitude with that of the murmurers.<sup>60</sup>

Furthermore, Lk's addition of the logion of v.10, where ζητῆσαι echoes v.3a, indicates that he understood salvation to be due to Jesus' initiative (as in 5,32) and not man's, thus reversing the point of view recorded in v.3a where it is Zacchaeus who sought to see Jesus. It is Jesus, not Zacchaeus, who is the central figure --like the father in the parable of (the so often called) "the Prodigal Son".

By the addition of v.9a, υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ceased to have an exclusivist sense of race and came to be synonymous with "a man of faith".<sup>61</sup> This is the reason for which σωτηρία came to him

<sup>58</sup>Half of his goods, a right measure of sharing; it is twice that which was legally required (see n.59). See 1 QSvi, 19f.22.24f, and Josephus, *War* ii,122.

<sup>59</sup>On the legal aspects of Zacchaeus' obligation of restitution see Ex.21,37; Lev.5,21-44; Ezek.33,15. Further details are provided by J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, London 1970, 278-285, and Billerbeck II, 249f; IV,546ff.

<sup>60</sup>The contrast is already given by the adversative δέ in v.8a. See further Loewe, "Towards an Interpretation" 322f,329f.

<sup>61</sup>"Son of Abraham" in its normal usage designated those of Jewish race, with the added connotation "son of the promise, heir of God's blessings". It included race as much as faith. In the present context it means what the biblical phrase "counted as son of Abraham" did, i.e. one justified by faith --concretized in deeds. Contrast the reference in Lk.3,8/Mt.3,9 with Jn.8,39; Rom.4,3; Gal.3,6f, and Hebr.11,8. See N.A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (F.S.P. Schubert), Nashville 1966, 139-158, and Loewe, *art.cit.* 326.

and his household.<sup>62</sup> By the addition of v.9a and the preservation of v.9b, pre-Lk pointed out that salvation was also the lot of the Jews but under the condition that they be true sons of Abraham, i.e. that they believe in Christ (cf.3,8!).

With the addition of "Son of Man" a universalistic extent was given to the logion of v.10. The expression τὸ ἀπολωλός became a moral judgment passed by the Church on those not yet converted. This also explains the addition of σῶσαι. We are beyond Ezek.34. The addition of this logion, which probably responds to a desire to clarify v.9 and to give a broader basis to the whole narrative, makes it the climax of the whole pericope. The main point becomes: whoever is open to Christ's initiative will find him and in him salvation. It echoes back to the question posed in 18,8b: "when the Son of Man comes will he find faith on earth?"

#### E. The Verb ἔρχεσθαι in the Logion Lk.19,10.

In its simplest form as an ἦλθον-saying, the verb ἔρχεσθαι + inf. on the lips of Jesus refers to a task to accomplish. The precise nuance of ἦλθον is obtained from the task precised by the infinitive of purpose. "To seek the lost" may be a self-assumed mission, as that of a person zealous for the propagation of the "ideology" he defends. Could it also be considered as a mission entrusted by another? It does not approach ἀπεστάλην for the one who seeks is also the one who judges who the "lost ones" really are. Formulated in the first person, as a declaration of intentionality, it is equivalent to "my purpose/intention is to ...." It presents a missionary outlook.

The change from ἦλθον to ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in a saying that refers back to Ezek.34 suggests, as we already indicated, an identification of the figures of the SM and of Jesus as the shepherd. By designating Jesus as the Son of Man a tag is put on his God-given ἐξουσία,<sup>63</sup> --that authority whereby he offers salvation. In connection with the verb ἔρ-

<sup>62</sup>Similarly Klostermann, Lk 185. To the contrary, Lagrange, Lk 490, Schmid, Lk 287, and Schweizer, in TDNT VIII, 365. See further Billerbeck II, 251.

<sup>63</sup>Cf. Tödt, Son of Man 134.

ἔρχεσθαι his origin from God is apparently presupposed, the more so if the words of Yahweh are appropriated. It has an eschatological outlook, not only on account of the titular "Son of Man" but also because of the reference to salvation and to "the lost ones" (see already 18,8b).

By applying to Jesus the words of Yahweh in Ezek.34, Jesus is understood as the epiphany of the Lord, the actual coming of Yahweh to lead his flock and seek the lost, i.e. the realization of the prophetic words of Ezekiel --which is underlined by the verb ἔρχεσθαι: he came! In this logion, the role of Jesus as actualization of Ezek.34 and the figure of the SM have been combined. It has therefore Messianic connotations. The sentence has, therefore, the strict sense of "the SM came in order to ...,"<sup>64</sup> and looks back at the totality of Jesus' career.

### Conclusion.

We have seen that this pericope, which was received by Lk from his special source, had been considerably reworked by the final redactor, especially noteworthy being the addition of v.8 and of the logion in v.10. Originally it ended with v.9b as a response to the murmurers of v.7. The saying of v.9a was later added by pre-Lk so as to broaden the "nationalistic outlook" left by v.9b. The pericope served a didactic purpose and was preserved by Lk especially for its rich-poor theme. This pericope thus complements the account of the cure of the blind beggar (18,35-43).

The logion of v.10, having had very probably a separate (independent?) existence, was introduced by Lk. It was added so as to create the climax of the story by giving a definite Christologically oriented response to the murmurers. Lk already received it as a SM-saying to which, because of a lack of explanation for ζητῆσαι and the reference to σωτηρία in v. 9a, he added καὶ σῶσαι. Comparing our logion with two other logia analogous to Lk.19,10, viz. Mk.2,17b par. and Mt.15,24, we reached the conclusion that even though the terminology of our

---

<sup>64</sup>Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 13, rightly observed that: "Emphatisch tritt hier ἦλθεν voran."

logion corresponds to that of Mk.2,17b par. --which helped us to precise an earlier form of our logion,-- there has more probably been a development from that of Mt.15,24, and not Mk.2,17b, towards Lk.19,10 on account of the reference to Ezek. 34,16a. In any event, the earlier form had been in the first person, formulated either as ἦλθον (as Mk.2,17b; which seems more probable) or as ἀπεστάλην (as Mt.15,24), and made no reference to saving but to seeking. Even if it could be considered as having been uttered by Jesus, it is more likely that it was the result of the Church's reflection on Jesus' mission and was placed on his lips. As an ἦλθον-saying, it would have said: "my purpose/intention is to ...."

As a Son of Man-saying the figures of the shepherd, of Ezek.34, and of the SM were combined, thus giving at once a messianic and an eschatological (not lastly by the addition of σωσαι) import to our logion. The logion said what the expression "the Son of Man came to ..." means in the strict sense of "came". Jesus is understood as having accomplished the prophetic announcement of Ezekiel as the epiphany of the Lord.

- - - - -

### III. THE DUBIOUS LOGIA: Lk.9,56a and Mt.18,11.

Lk.9,56a and Mt.18,11 are two ἦλθεν-sayings which are invariably relegated to the critical apparatus, i.e. they are considered by the majority of scholars to be late interpolations. We shall briefly study these, concentrating on the question of their textual origin and antiquity before giving an appretiation of their eventual significance. The first and decisive question to answer is whether they were an authentic and integral part of the gospel(s) bequeathed to us.

#### A. The Son of Man Came to Save Souls: Lk.9,56a.<sup>1</sup>

A number of MSS contain two logia, following ἐπετίμησεν

<sup>1</sup>This saying, as well as the immediately preceding ones have been the object of at least two detailed studies: J.M. Ross, "The Rejected Words in Luke 9<sup>54-56</sup>," ExpT 84(1972/73) 85-88, and J.M. Bover, "Autenticidad de Lc 9,54-56," EstEcl 27 (1953) 347-349. T. Zahn, in his commentary to Lk dedicated several pages to it (401f, 765-768), as did A. Harnack in "Ich bin gekommen", 14-16.

αὐτοῖς in v.55, which in all our editions of the Greek New Testament are relegated to the critical apparatus. These are v.54c.55b.56a.<sup>2</sup> Behold the dialogue in full:

- v.54 b. κύριε, θέλεις εἰπῶμεν πῶς καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτοῦς(ς)  
c. ὥς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν;  
v.55 a. στραφεῖς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς  
b. καὶ εἶπεν, οὐκ οἴδατε ποίου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς;  
v.56 a. ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων  
ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι.

In keeping within the limits of our main subject of study I shall concentrate mostly on v.55b.56a.

### 1. Text Critical Considerations.

The various criteria used for the establishment of the probable originality of a given text, or part of it, concern two areas of relations: the witnesses (mostly manuscripts) to its origin --external criteria,-- and the relation of the text in question to the context wherein it is found --internal criteria. We shall study our text in the light of these criteria.

#### a. External Criteria.

The witnesses to v.56a are: the Koine and Caesarean (Θ, the Lake and Ferrar groups) texts, the Vulgate and Old Latin (aur,a,b,c,e,f,q,r<sup>1</sup>) as well as the Syrian (c,p,h) versions, the Coptic (boh.), Armenian and Ethiopian versions, and a number of minuscules and Lectionaries. To these should be added the witness of Ambrose,<sup>3</sup> Epiphanius, Antiochus, and especially such early witnesses as Cyprian, Tatian, Marcion and Tertullian.<sup>4</sup> The witnesses to v.55b are all these plus D, it<sup>d</sup> and the Georgian version.

The majority of scholars consider v.55b.56a as late glosses on the basis of MS evidence which is late, while, it is argued, they are absent in the most reliable ones (X,B,P<sup>45.75</sup>,

<sup>2</sup>There is another "gloss" in v.54b, viz. ὥς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν, which I will leave out of the discussion for the sake of simplicity. For a clear presentation of the textual variants see esp. The Greek New Testament, ed. Aland-Black-et al., ad loc.

<sup>3</sup>Expos. ev. Luc. vii,60: "filius enim hominis non uenit animas hominum perdere, sed saluas facere."

<sup>4</sup>Ambrosiaster, Quaest. 102,1, should also be named.

syr<sup>s</sup>). V.56a is generally explained as being an interpolated gloss that copies Lk.19,10. However, little attention has been paid to the attestation of the early writers named above who must have received this logion from a tradition known to them. Thus:

(i) Tertullian, in Adv. Marc. iv,23, though not citing this logion as having been used by Marcion in his Antithesis, gives the impression that the latter actually did so for, he writes:

(8) 'Repraesentat creator ignium plagam Helia postulante in illo pseudopropheta.' Agnosco iudicis severitatem; e contrario Christi < lenitatem increpantis > eandem animaduersionem destinantes discipulos super illum viculum Samaritarum: agnoscat et hereticus ... (9) non in igni, inquit dominus, sed in spiritu miti .... (10) Et utique damnauit quem recusauit, non consecuturum silicet salutem. Nam sicut ad salutem <sup>5</sup> uocat quem non recusat uel etiam quem ulto uocat,...

If Tertullian wrote this against Marcion, is it not because the latter misused the "excised" clauses?

(ii) That Tertullian himself knew a logion like Lk.9,56a is suggested in de Carne Christi xii,7: "Et ueni, inquit, animam saluam facere." This saying is understandable as coming from Lk.9,56a, not from Lk.19,10 or Mt.18,11.<sup>6</sup>

(iii) In Cyprian's Letter n.64 we read: "(2) Nam cum Dominus in euangelio suo dixit: Filius hominis non uenit animas hominum perdere, sed saluare quantum in nobis est, ...." We find here Lk.9,56a being cited.

(iv) Even though we do not have direct access to Tatian's Diatessaron, it is known that the Curetonian version was influenced by Tatian's text. Lk.9,56 reads: "you know not of what spirit you are, for the Son of Man came not to destroy lives [lit. souls] but to save [lit. give life]."<sup>7</sup> It is likewise to be found in the Arabic (= to the Peshitta), Tuscan and Old Dutch versions, which have the same reading as syr<sup>c</sup>.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup>See the observations of Zahn, Lk 401, 766f, and Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 15.

<sup>6</sup>See Zahn's discussion, Lk 767.

<sup>7</sup>Text and English version: Burkitt, Evangelion Da-Mephar-reshe. It is absent in the palimpsest of Sinai.

<sup>8</sup>The Tuscan version reads "Son of the Virgin" in lieu of "Son of Man". The Venetian version has a lacuna at this place. A discussion on these and other related versions will be ///



Whether here it is the Diatessaron, or the Latin version (which would seem more probable given the absence of "because" and "of men", as in the Vg) that is echoed is most difficult to determine with certitude, but the former remains probable.

The value of these witnesses is not to be scoffed at for they are earlier than the majority of MSS, including our "most reliable ones." They are approximately contemporaneous to P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> (3d cent.), the latter witnessing a tradition that did not possess these logia. This suggests the existence of two lines of tradition that ran parallel. The citation made by Cyprian (+258) --which echoes no other logion than that of Lk.9,56a-- indicates that this saying circulated in a written gospel and that it was considered to be authentic. Since MSS witnessing to v.56a also have v.55b, it follows that they were bequeathed together. It is to be noticed that nevertheless v.55b.56a do not follow as two propositions logically interlocked. However, the witnesses to v.56a also contain v.55b! One may therefore wonder: if these were created deliberately by a late scribe, would he not have been clearer and made them flow into a logically related unity? Is v.55b a statement or a question? The explicative  $\gamma\acute{o}\epsilon$  (absent in the vg, it, syr<sup>c,p</sup>, Diat<sup>Ar,T,N</sup>) barely connects them. From both possibilities, an addition and an omission, the latter seems more probable.

The number of variants witnessing the absence of one or several of the three clauses (54c.55b.56a) is most indicative. According to the text they transmitted, the MSS can be classed into five groups, depending on whether or not they contain all three clauses, two, or even one of them.<sup>9</sup> If these, especially v.55b.56a, were added later we would expect a greater uniformity of witnesses. Yet, what we find is a great disparity in their origins and tendencies, as J.M. Bover had pointed out.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, v.55b.56a are absent in those MSS that tend most

---

/// found in the study of F.C. Burkitt, "St Luke IX 54-56 and the Western 'Diatessaron'," *JTS* 28(1927), 48-53.

<sup>9</sup>The following MSS do not contain the following clauses: (1) v.54c: ite,vg,syrc,arm; (2) v.56a: D it<sup>d</sup>; (3) v.54c.56a: geo; (4) v.55b.56a: A,C,E,G,H,V,X, $\Omega$ , it<sup>r2</sup>,syr<sup>pal</sup>,eth, 047,028; (5) all three: P<sup>45.75</sup>, $\kappa$ ,B,L,it<sup>g,1</sup>,syr<sup>s</sup>,sa,bo.

<sup>10</sup>"Autenticidad" 348.

to add glosses, viz. A,E,G,H,Ω, 028. That first one clause was added and later a second one is excluded, given the fact that v.56a has witnesses that are earlier (esp. Cyprian) than that witnessing to v.55b without v.56a, viz. D (5th cent.). It is easier to think that D, it<sup>d</sup> and the Georgian version dropped v.56a than to find a reason explaining why v.55b may have been added once v.56a was there. Now, if the original was the longest text, i.e. containing v.54c.55b.56a, it is easier to understand the omission of one or more of these clauses in the different manuscripts, i.e. their disparity.<sup>11</sup>

#### b. Internal Criteria.

On examining the account of Lk.9,51-56 one is at once struck by the absence of a climax. As M. Dibelius<sup>12</sup> and R. Bultmann<sup>13</sup> remarked, if v.55b.56a were authentic then we would have a Paradigm/Apophthegm. A second, more important observation, is that when the verb ἐπιτιμᾶν is used (in Lk) it never remains by itself as a sort of absolute, i.e. it is never found without a reaction-response, or the statement or a reason, or the observation of the consequence of the rebuke.<sup>14</sup> A third, yet more conjectural, observation is the Semitic-like expression ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων (= D7X ʔ9J, statum constructum), which recurs only in Rom.2,9 and Apoc.18,13 (=Ex.27,13).<sup>15</sup> The fact that some MSS (vg, it<sup>aur,c,e</sup>, goth) and Tertullian (de Carne Christi xii,7) have omitted ἀνθρώπων is explicable as having been considered, according to their anthropology, as superfluous. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that Cyprian knew this expression. One may well wonder whether a non-Semitic mind would have invented such an expression. The use of "the

<sup>11</sup>See Bover, "Autenticidad" 348.

<sup>12</sup>Tradition 48: "If this change may be regarded as probable [...], then we may reckon the narrative in its original form as a Paradigm."

<sup>13</sup>ST 25.

<sup>14</sup>Lk.18,15.39; 19,39; 23,40 provide a reaction-response; 4,35.41; 9,21; 17,3; 18,39 are followed by the reason for the rebuke and, 4,39; 8,24; 9,42 state the outcome of Jesus' "rebuke" on adverse natural phenomena. Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 15, had already observed this unusual ending in v.55.

<sup>15</sup>In the LXX it is found in Lev.24,17; Num.9,6.7.10; 19,11.13; 30,3; 31,35.40.46; Isa.13,7; Ezek.27,13; 44,25; Wis.14,5 (inverted).11; Sir.21,2; 1 Mac.2,38; 9,2.

Son of Man" is not necessarily an indication of the primitiveness of v.56a: it could have been used by a scribe who desired to give it an air of authenticity. However, given the fact that later this title fell into disuse, it could witness to the originality of v.56a: a late copist could have used ἦλθον instead.

### c. Searching for an Explanation.

Could Lk.9,56a be a reshaped duplication of Lk.19,10? Let us compare the two texts, including the suggestive phrase in Lk.6,9c/Mk.3,4c:

<u>Lk.9,56a</u>	<u>Lk.19,10</u>	<u>Lk.6,9c/Mk.3,4c</u>
ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων	ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.	ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι
ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι.		

We observe that the opposition (ψυχὴν) ἀπολέσαι - σῶσαι of 9,56a is found again in 6,9c/Mk.3,4c --and also in 9,24 par. In 6,9c and 9,56a the context refers to a concern for man's natural life. However, by using ψυχὴν, which for a non-Semitic mind meant as much as "the soul" does to us today, and especially by the non-univocal σῶσαι, the soteriological dimension of Jesus' mission is brought to the fore. This suggests that the relation between 9,56a and 6,9c is close, indeed closer than with 19,10.<sup>16</sup> In the logion of 19,10 the term σῶσαι no longer has the natural sense of "to render whole (including salvation)" which it still preserves in 9,56a. Rather, 19,10 has an exclusively soteriological meaning. As in 19,10, "Son of Man" in 9,56a may be a later substitution of an older "I" --whence the soteriological orientation of 9,56a would have been precised.<sup>17</sup> (ψυχὰς) ἀνθρώπων may be older than the flat ψυχὴν of 6,9c, since it is a Semitism for "man's life". Furthermore, ἀπολέσαι in 9,56a and 6,9c (to destroy-condemn) does

<sup>16</sup> Similarly Zahn, Lk 402 n.45. Jeremias, "Schicht" 166, and NTTh I, 263, sees Lk.9,56a as a logion that has originated in 6,9c: it was formed into a SM-saying, according to him.

<sup>17</sup> It is to be noted that, except for Lk.19,10, neither ἀπολέσαι nor σῶσαι are elsewhere associated with the SM. Was, therefore, "the Son of Man" inspired on Lk.19,10?

not have the same sense as τὸ ἀπολωλός in 19,10 (lost but not yet condemned). This suggests that, if there was any influence, it was from 9,56a to 19,10 and not the inverse, and it strengthens our contention that καὶ σῶσαι had been added by RLk to 19,10 (q.v.).

If the terms ἀπολέσαι and σῶσαι had their ordinary meanings then 9,56a could hardly have existed independently but needed a context to make such an affirmation understandable. On the other hand, if it always was a SM-saying, and (therefore) Jesus' purpose was soteriologically understood, it could have had an independent existence. We must reckon with the fact that the impression left by the text, especially the non-consequent γὰρ (cf. supra), is that the logion did not constitute an integral part of the story from the beginning --and therefore existed independently-- since it was soteriologically understood. However, it is not totally impossible that it was RLk who inserted v.55b and added γὰρ (and SM?) to v.56a. In fact, references to πνεῦμα are quite frequent in Lk and not rarely with a negative qualification. The question, however, must be left open for lack of evidence. What is observable is that, neither the logion of 9,56a nor that of 19,10 could be transposed to the context of the other without an adaptation and change of formulation, i.e. they are not interchangeable.

Verse 55b as a statement would have sufficed and been clear enough as Jesus' reason for rebuking the disciples. Codex Bezae, it<sup>d</sup>, and geo. --which have only v.55b as a statement,-- may have realized this and therefore --among other possible reason-- omitted v.56a.

It is relatively simple to attempt to explain the presence of these sayings in the MSS that contain them: the story is without an expected climax that could give it a richer catechetical value. The need of an addition of an appropriate logion would have been felt so as to have all the elements making up an Apophthegm. That would also provide a profound reason for Jesus' rebuke to the sons of Zebedee. But could their absence in other MSS be equally explained?

Any reason for wanting to omit the logia of v.54c.55b.56a would be of a theological nature: a dangerous tendency to mis-

understand and misuse them.<sup>18</sup> This danger could have come from the Marcionite and/or other circles, and therefore were omitted at an early stage. Later, once the danger was no longer present, they were rehabilitated.

It can hardly be denied that the logia of v.54c.55b.56a would have given an added occasion to the Marcionites to oppose the NT to the OT; the spirit of Jesus in his search for salvation, to the spirit of Elijah as hard punishing judge to which reference is made in v.54c --both are synthezied in the logion of v.56a. This would evidently have been a good and, in my opinion, most plausible reason for the various excisions.<sup>19</sup>

The possibility of scribal distraction (homoearcton) is to be excluded. The fact that there exist so many different "distractions" as those witnessed by our MSS is the result of anything but "distractions" --they are intentional alterations of the text.<sup>20</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that, as J.M. Bover indicated, other difficult passages have also been omitted (eg. Lk.22,43f; 23,34; Jn.8,1-11) in the main MSS which also omitted the passages we are considering.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, we may conclude that, all considerations taken into account, the probability that v.54c.55b.56a were an integral part of the gospel of Luke are by far higher than that they were not.<sup>22</sup>

## 2. Did Jesus Pronounce the Logion Lk.9,56a ?

Assuming that we are dealing with a logion that was pre-

---

<sup>18</sup>Other possible reasons for the omission of Lk.9,55b.56a are given by Ross, "Rejected Words" 86f. These include: scribal homoearcton (but see above) and the desire to excise what was derogatory to the disciples' good reputation.

<sup>19</sup>Thus Zahn, Lk 401; see also Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 15, and Bover, "Autenticidad" 348. The argument is rejected by Ross, art.cit. 87 (as improbable), and by Lagrange, Lk 285 (who thinks they are of Marcionite origin!).

<sup>20</sup>Against Ross, art.cit. 87.

<sup>21</sup>Art.cit. 349.

<sup>22</sup>Similarly Ross, art.cit.; Bover, art.cit.; and with caution Zahn and Harnack. It is noteworthy that the only two in-depth studies on this passage (viz. Ross and Bover) conclude that it was part of Lk's gospel; that is also Zahn's inclination.

sent in the gospel bequeathed to us, we must now ask ourselves whether or not Jesus may have uttered the logion of 9,56a in its probable oldest form, viz. οὐκ ἦλθον ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι.

Before we proceed to consider the question of authenticity under the light of the authenticating criteria, we must precise its sense: did it refer to physical "salvation" (as the context seems to suggest) or is there a soteriological meaning intended. Seen within its present context, ψυχὰς ( ) σῶσαι must mean more than just to procure health: the Samaritans were evidently neither sick nor dying and therefore σῶσαι cannot refer to this aspect; that is also what 2 Kgs.1,10.12, which is in the background, suggests. Furthermore, Jesus' concern was not primarily with one's physical well-being but with the will of God and its implantation, i.e. ψυχὰς ( ) σῶσαι would entail the whole existence of man intended to share in the heavenly banquet. To think of "I did not come to destroy" as a possible statement of Jesus would be most strange if "to destroy" did not mean "to condemn" but "to harm/kill". As a reaction to the allusion to Elijah (v.54b), it suggests a rather figurative (apocalyptic) representation. Thus, we should think of this logion in a soteriological sense. We have already indicated that, if the logion existed separately then it must have had a soteriological meaning --which would explain its continuous preservation.

a. Attestation. This logion is not directly attested elsewhere in the NT. However, it finds an echo in Jam.4,12a: εἷς ἐστὶν νομοθέτης καὶ κριτής, ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι, as well as in Jn.12,47 and 1 Tim.1,15. These, as well as Lk.19,10, suggest that we are dealing with a logion that has its origin in the early Church rather than in Jesus.

b. Language. From the linguistic point of view, the vocabulary of this logion is not in its entirety "Lukan". While ἀπολέσαι, with respect to salvation, is not rare in Lk (4,34; 9,25; 13,3.5; 17,33), the opposition to σῶσαι occurs in 6,9c/ Mk.3,4c(!) and 9,24 par. The expression ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων is unique, and the οὐκ - ἀλλά formulation is not one he uses often (contrast 12,51 with Mt.10,34, q.v.). Thus, it is doubt-

ful that we are dealing with a Lkan "creation".

The retroversion into Aramaic (ܐܬܝܬ ܠܥܡܪܐ (ܦܫܬܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ) ܐܠܝܐ ܠܥܡܪܐ) is not impossible, but the couplet ἀπολέσαι - σῶσαι is not what could be termed Semitic, but rather of Hellenistic provenance.

c. Coherence. The criterion of coherence, or consistency, between what we know of Jesus' teaching and activity and our logion, brings to mind that Jesus called to conversion, repentance, to welcome his preaching and message, but it was not characteristic of his preaching to announce that he was granting salvation. In fact, σῶζειν, when referring to the eventuality of eternal salvation, in the Syn is almost invariably used in the passive voice (see eg. Mt.9,22; 10,22; 19,25; 24,13; etc.), meaning that salvation is granted by God only.

d. Distinctiveness. From the outset it must be said that it is easier to understand this logion as a Church product than as an utterance of Jesus. That is what our previous considerations have been suggesting. In its negative dialectic form it says "I have come not so much to destroy/bring eternal condemnation as to save." The negative clause contains a view of Christ as final judge, and this was the understanding gained by the Church --it is post-Paschal. Furthermore, the affirmative clause, giving as object the salvation of men --which echoes Mt.1,21; 1 Tim.1,15, and esp. Lk.19,10,-- is hardly what Jesus would have said for all other similar statements on his lips have the (divine?) passive of σῶζειν (contrast with 1 Cor.1,18 and 2 Tim.1,9).

We may therefore conclude that, as a soteriologically intended statement Lk.9,56a most probably had its origin in the early Church and can be assumed to be "inauthentic".<sup>23</sup>

### 3. The Meaning of Lk.9,56a and the Significance of "Εὐχεσθαι"

In its presumed earliest form, i.e. as an "I" saying, our logion mentioned in general terms the object of Jesus' ministry. As a simple statement of fact ἡλθον + inf. meant "my ministry has for purpose ...," i.e. the weight is on the side of the infinitives of purpose --which the context highlights.

<sup>23</sup>Bover, "Autenticidad" 349, considers it to be authentic.

As a SM-saying the logion was given an eschatological orientation. Now ἀπολέσαι refers to the eternal judgment, albeit condemnation, and the negative clause implicitly contains the affirmation --in dialectic fashion: οὐκ - ἀλλά-- of this role of Christ. This aspect had been overemphasized by Marcion. Yet, the weight of the logion lies on the salvific will of Christ. "Son of Man" establishes a contrast between Jesus' mission and Elijah's; it looks back at the totality of Jesus' mission on earth and to the continuous salvific will of Christ.

The effect of the expression ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς κτλ. is, as elsewhere, to bring out the God-given authority with which Jesus carried out his mission.<sup>24</sup> It suggests the divine origin of Jesus himself. ἦλθεν therefore approaches ἀπεστάλη and contrasts with Elijah's return. Elijah, it was understood, had appeared in the person of John the Baptist (cf. Mt. 17, 11ff par.); Jesus in turn was the final and definite envoy of God who came to offer God's salvation. ἦλθεν + inf. therefore means, when transposed to the first person, "my God-given mission (for which I came to the world) is ...."

In its present form, our logion serves as an exhortation to conversion and acceptance of the path to salvation inaugurated by Jesus and continuously offered by Christ. Implicit in the whole story is therefore a call to early Christians (missionaries!) not to expect an immediate divine vengeance or punishment on those who refuse to accept Christ, but to overlook them and to move forward announcing the Good News.

### Conclusion.

We have found that the ἦλθεν-logion, which by the majority of scholars is too quickly dismissed as a late gloss, has very high chances of being an integral part of the gospel of Luke. Furthermore, on the assumption of its originality, it was found that it is difficult to find an origin for this logion other than the Church herself. The omission of v. 54c.55b. 56a by a number of MSS was probably due to the misuses of which they were object, quite probably by the Marcionites.

The expression ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τ. ᾧ. --which is possibly a change from an older ἦλθον form-- points to Christ's continu-

---

<sup>24</sup>Rightly underlined by Tödt, SM 134.



ous salvific will without denying his role as a judge, and acquires a kerygmatic value. What at first meant "the purpose of my ministry is ..." became, through the influence mainly of SM and the addition of v.55b, akin to ἀπεστάλην so that it sees Jesus' mission as a God-given and entrusted one, and contrasts with that of Elijah (v.54c).

## B. The Son of Man Came to Save the Lost: Mt.18,11.

We shall study this logion --which is rejected by all scholars as a late gloss which copies Lk.19,10,-- proceeding in the same manner as we did with Lk.9,56a.

### 1. External Criteria of Textual Authenticity.

Even though absent in our most important manuscripts and among the early Church Fathers, the logion ἦλθεν (γὰρ) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός is to be found in the Codex D and W, the Koine and Old Latin, vg, Syriac (c,p,h), Bohairic, Ethiopic, Armenian and Georgian versions, as well as in many minuscules and Lectionaries. It is also attested by Hilary, Chrysostom, Augustin, and the various Diatessaron versions (Arabic [=Peshitta], Old Dutch, Tuscan and Venetian).<sup>1</sup>

This logion is identical to that of Lk.19,10, except for the absence of ζητῆσαι --which is found in the it<sup>c</sup>, syr<sup>h</sup>, bo, and eth. versions, as well as a number of Lectionaries, evidently in order to harmonize the two sayings.<sup>2</sup> This fact suggests either a "borrowing" of Lk.19,10 --which is otherwise absent in Mt,-- or the possible independent existence of this saying --which would confirm our contention that it was so for Lk.19,10.

### 2. Internal Criteria of Textual Authenticity.

When considering the context in which this saying is found, one observes that it neither fits adequately nor is necessary to the pericope. The passage from v.10 to v.12-14 is obscured by v.11. This verse would in fact be pleonastic since it bears the same basic idea as v.14 (even if from a dif-

<sup>1</sup>Clement of Alex. alludes to it in Strom. III, xiv, 94.2.

<sup>2</sup>Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II, 328, was of the opinion that because of the absence of ζητῆσαι, the word most needed in this context, it is very doubtful that Mt.18,11 is a gloss and that it was taken from Lk.19,10.

ferent standpoint),<sup>3</sup> and verses 10 and 14 (hookword μικροί) constitute an inclusio to the Parable of the Lost Sheep. It is likewise important to observe that not only is the form and vocabulary identical to that of Lk.19,10, but it is more dogmatic in so far as it omits ζητῆσαι and leaves only σῶσαι, thus being akin to Jn.3,17 and 1 Tim.1,15.

### 3. Searching for an Explanation.

Reasons for wanting to insert v.11 in its present context are not difficult to find. The idea of the "lost"<sup>4</sup> sheep could have attracted this saying, to give a Christological foundation to the Parable and to serve as a bridge between v.10 and v.12-14.<sup>5</sup> The pericope (v.10.12-14) stresses the Father's --and not Jesus'!-- concern for men, i.e. it gives a Theological, not Christological (as v.11), point of view.<sup>6</sup> While in v.10.14 the term used for those who are easily lost is μικροί, in v.11 it is τὸ ἀπολωλός, i.e. those actually lost (cf. Lk.19,10!). That a need for a connective between v.10 and v.12-14 was felt to be necessary may come from the fact that while v.10 refers to the μικροί as those who belong to the Church, i.e. the followers of Christ, but who are simple as little children and easily scandalized (=lost), in v.12-14 the μικροί are those actually lost and who have to be sought out; they are the lost sheep.

### 4. Significance of Mt.18,11.

The parable was originally polemically addressed to the Pharisees that were scandalized at Jesus' habitual dealings with the outcasts. The μικροί were originally the simple followers of Jesus who, like little children, are easily scandalized and lost.<sup>7</sup> Its original "setting in life" in Palestinian

<sup>3</sup>Not with v.10b, as Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II, 328, supposed and gave as reason for the excision in many MSS.

<sup>4</sup>However, it must be noted that the term used by the parable is the Mtan πλανῶ, and v.11 uses a synonym, ἀπολωλός -- which is that used in Lk.19,10.

<sup>5</sup>See Montefiore, Gospels II, 249, McNeile, Mt 264, and Metzger, Textual Commentary 45.

<sup>6</sup>On this see esp. Tödt, SM 134f.

<sup>7</sup>It hardly refers to the poor, as held by Schniewind, Mt 199, nor to the Church as such, as had been proposed by Bultmann, ST 145.

soil is easily detectable from the vocabulary used<sup>8</sup> and the presupposition of an acquaintance with Palestinian life. Mt placed it in its present ecclesiastic context (c.18), as the context (v.6-9.15-17) indicates. Thus, a pericope that originally thought of the μικροί as those who were like children, simple, easily scandalized and lost, now are understood to be those already lost, who have cut themselves off from the community. What originally was polemic in nature now, through the working of Mt, has become a community rule, and v.10.12-14 acquired the tone of an admonition against possible discriminatory practices.<sup>9</sup> The implication is an exhortation, nay, a rule, to try by all means to bring those who have gone astray back to the community. A parable has become a parenetic Church rule.

Understood as a community rule, v.11 would have been added in order to reinforce the always actual ecclesiastic concern for all men, especially for the "lost ones", by having recourse to the Lord's authority as expressed in a saying as that found in Lk.19,10 --wherein a concrete case exemplified it; note that Mt did not include the story of Zacchaeus in his gospel.

### Conclusion.

That Mt.18,11 is spurious and probably borrowed from Lk. 19,10 should be clear. The different witnesses to it are relatively late and come from different traditions. We can conclude that we are dealing with a real gloss.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Angels, the face of God, heaven, the will of God, the circumloquiums for God, the οὐκ - clause in v.14 as well as its superfluous τοῦτων, are some of the most evident traces of an original Palestinian origin.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Manson, Sayings 208. It hardly refers to Church excommunications, as suggested by McNeile, Mt 264, but at the most to those who excommunicate themselves, i.e. to the sinners, who are the lost ones.

<sup>10</sup>That is universally admitted. However, Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II, 328, doubts that it is a gloss and thinks that we probably have two traditions of this pericope: a Syriac one, having v.11, and a Roman one without v.11.

## CHAPTER THREE

### OTHER HAΘON-RELATED SAYINGS

In this chapter we shall study four sayings which, although they are not "I have come/the Son of Man came to ..." sayings, they are closely related to them. These are:

1. "I came forth/was sent (to preach)": Mk.1,38/Lk.4,43,
2. "Did you come to destroy us?" : Mk.1,24/Lk.4,43 and Mt.8,29/Mk.5,7/Lk.8,28,
3. "John - the Son of Man came ...": Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f,
4. the question of Elijah's coming: Mk.9,11-13/Mt.17,10-13.

All except the 2d are on Jesus' lips and it is for this reason that these are singled out among other significant uses of ἔε-  
χεσθαι --others being considered in c.VI.<sup>1</sup> The second one receives special attention because it is the only statement made by anyone, addressed to Jesus (not pronounced by him), about the latter's coming and its significance. The first two sayings concern the purpose of Jesus' public ministry and are, indeed, complementary. In the last two Jesus touches indirectly on the significance of his "coming".

#### I. COME FORTH TO PREACH: Mk.1,35-38/Lk.4,42-43.<sup>2</sup>

The pericope constituted by Mk.1,35-38/Lk.4,42-43 and absent in Mt, paints Jesus' first attempt to broaden his ministry. It is immediately preceded by an implication that Jesus had spent the night in the house of Simon Peter whose mother-in-law he had cured, and a summary statement about his thaumaturgic activity in Capharnaum till late that evening. It is followed by another summary statement, Mk.1,39/Lk.4,44. In

<sup>1</sup>Two other sayings are treated at length not here but in c.VI, on account of the terminology used: the only ἀπεσταλὴν-saying, Mt.15,24, and the uses of ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

<sup>2</sup>Recent detailed studies of this pericope include R. Pesch, "Ein Tag vollmächtigen Wirkens Jesu in Kapharnaum," *BLEb* 9 (1968), 261-277 and M. Wichelhaus, "Am Ersten Tage der Woche," *NovT* 11 (1969), 45-66. To these, among the commentaries, H. Schürmann's massive commentary to Luke should be singled out, (HTKNT III/1), 255f.

both, Mk and Lk, the position of this pericope is totally artificial: the immediately preceding and following activity of Jesus is not found to have been that of preaching, as the main point of our pericope would like us to believe, but rather a thaumaturgic one. As if to soften it, Lk has placed the call of the disciples (5,1-11) between our pericope and the cures of the leper and of the paralytic (5,12-26). Furthermore, Mk has Jesus back in Capharnaum (2,1), which clashes with the intention manifested in 1,38. Lk avoided such an inconsequence. Mt simply omitted our pericope as superfluous.<sup>3</sup>

#### A. Literary Analysis.

Since the alternation between ἐξῆλθον and ἀπεστάλην is the center of our interest, v.35-37/Lk.4,42 will be considered only in so far as they help us gain a better insight into the meaning and implications of v.38.<sup>4</sup>

The expression ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν, in v.35,<sup>5</sup> has a Semitic flavour which may warrant its antiquity.<sup>6</sup> Lk shows his preference for a participle instead of a coordinate + καί, as he does elsewhere,<sup>7</sup> and he avoids using the same cognate verb

---

<sup>3</sup>Mt would have found no reason for repeating the beginning of Jesus' ministry throughout Galilee, nor for including a story which did not fit his reworked schema since he had already, in a developed summary (4,23-25), pointed out the extent of Jesus' ministry and mission. Mt.8,5-9,34 is a cycle of events around Capharnaum that Mt has grouped together. It is within this cycle that he would have had to insert our pericope, after 8,16 (8,14-16/Mk.1,29-34!), if he had slavishly followed the Mkan schema. In 8,18 Mt portrays Jesus intending to flee from the crowds (8,18 has no direct parallel in Mk and Lk!), and one may wonder whether it is not Mt's adapted way of saying what Mk and Lk describe by means of our pericope. That our pericope did not fit into Mt's coherent rearrangement of the Capharnaum cycle is clear from his final summary statement in 9,35f. Thus, it can be assumed that Mt left intentionally our pericope out --and therefore knew it.

<sup>4</sup>The versification of Mk's gospel will be used throughout except when is necessary to single out Lk's. It is assumed that, as for previous pericopes, the reader has a Synopsis in front of him.

<sup>5</sup>W and it. omitted ἀπῆλθεν, and B and 28 omitted ἐξῆλθεν, both omissions being intentional --to avoid redundancy?

<sup>6</sup>Haenchen, Weg 92, and Hirsch, Frühgeschichte I, 7, are of the opinion that there may have been two diff. Aram. words at their origin and, according to C.C. Torrey, in JBL 53(1934), 23, this could have been nefaq we'ezal, however he warns: "It is not 'an Aramaism' at all, but simply the very familiar juxtaposition of two Semitic verbs."

<sup>7</sup>See Cadbury, Style 134f.

twice by introducing προεῦσθαι (similar change operated by Lk to Mk.6,36.37), a verb more of his liking.<sup>8</sup> The reference to prayer, which is surprisingly absent in Lk,<sup>9</sup> is unessential to the story. It may be safely considered to be a redactional addition; it is distracting: why did Jesus leave? in order to pray or to preach elsewhere? As we shall see, the reference to Jesus' prayer serves a theological purpose.

The last verse of our pericope gives the immediate reaction of Jesus by way of a protest against the very idea of having to remain in Capharnaum. In Mk it is introduced by the simple καὶ<sup>10</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς, a historical present which is characteristically frequent in Mk and may be his,<sup>11</sup> while Lk uses his favorite εἶπεν πρὸς + acc.<sup>12</sup> The direction in which Jesus intends to go is given in Mk by a doublet which, in view of its three hapax legomena, seems to have been in pre-Mk: ἀλλὰ-χού<sup>13</sup> εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις. Lk has modified this expression to read ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν. The adj. ἕτερος, in lieu of Mk's adverbial modifier, is quite Lkan,<sup>14</sup> and πόλεις is more

<sup>8</sup>It is found used 28/1(in 9,30)/49+39 times.

<sup>9</sup>Most exegetes are of the opinion that the reference to Jesus' prayer is primitive and that Lk omitted it; however, they struggle to find a satisfying reason for the supposed Lkan omission. Nineham, Mk 84, and Wichelhaus, "Am Ersten Tage" 61, consider it to be due to Mk, while Zimmermann, Methodenlehre 241, Schramm, Markus-Stoff 89, and Schürmann, Lk 256 n.262, think that Lk has transposed the reference to prayer to 5,16, a possibility which is not to be totally excluded. If one follows the "Two-Sources Theory" then one must assume that Lk omitted this reference to Jesus praying. However, nothing militates against the possibility that Lk, who more often than any other evangelist refers to Jesus' prayer (cf. 3,21; 5,16; 6,12; 9,18.28f; 11,1; 22,41.44) would also have mentioned it here if he had known it from his source. Surprisingly in both, 4,42 and 5,16, we find ἐρημος; why did not Lk then omit the reference to the ἐρημος τόπος in 4,42 also?

<sup>10</sup>The conjunction has here an adversative sense ("but"); cf. Zerwick, Markus-Stil 7f.

<sup>11</sup>See Hawkins, HS 143-148. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, used absolutely, is pre-Mkan in 2,25; 3,4; 7,18; 10,11; 12,16 (Kuhn, Samm-lungen 131 n.39). On the historical present in Mk see now W. Hendriks, "Zur Kollektionsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums," in L'Evangile selon Marc, Louvain 1974, 35-57.

<sup>12</sup>See Hawkins, HS 45f, and esp. Cadbury, Style 203, where many examples of this Lucanism will be found. The particle δέ, also used in v.42a, instead of Mk's καί is also quite Lkan, on which see Cadbury, op.cit. 143.

<sup>13</sup>Omitted by A,D,W,Θ, Koine, Ferrar, Lake, it,vg,syr<sup>s,p</sup>.

<sup>14</sup>9/0/33+17; cf. Cadbury, op.cit. 151f and Bl-D §306(2).

frequently used in Lk than in the other gospels (26/8/40). RLk achieves a more compact and precise sentence than his source's. Mk's hortative ἄγωμεν is obviously addressed to and dependent on the fact that it was "Simon and those with him" who acted as spokesmen for the crowds that were seeking Jesus. Lk is obliged to omit it since he deleted the reference to the disciples in favor of the ὄχλοι (v.42b); in its place he introduced the imperatival δεῖ (8/6/18+24) which he is so prone to do when there is question of an urgent submission to God's ordinance (cf. 9,22; 13,33; 17,25; 22,37; 24,44).

The purpose for Jesus' departure to other towns is recorded in Mk quite simply as ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω. Instead of κηρύσσειν, Lk has his customary εὐαγγελίζειν. Each is a term characteristic of the evangelist that uses it.<sup>15</sup> However, it is to be noted that εὐαγγελίζειν/εὐαγγέλιον had become in the early Church a terminus technicus and, for this reason κηρύσσειν, which is a more neutral term and here is objectless, may have been present in pre-Mk. While in Mk there is no object of κηρύσσειν given, in Lk we find it to be the βασιλεία τ. θεοῦ, as is so often the case in Lk (and Mt),<sup>16</sup> in view of which we may assume that it is a Lkan addition. The inclusive καί is found in both versions and was most probably in pre-Mk.<sup>17</sup>

The last phrase, the one which is the concern of our study, already betrays a Christological point of view in Lk, who uses the verb ἀποστέλλειν (by God!).<sup>18</sup> Since Lk tends to change ἔρχεσθαι for another verb,<sup>19</sup> we may conclude that the more primitive form is that found in Mk, where the verb ἐξέρχεσθαι is used instead.<sup>20</sup> By using ἀπεστάλην Lk would have

<sup>15</sup>Κηρύσσειν: 9/12/9, while εὐαγγελίζειν occurs 1/0/10x.

<sup>16</sup>Τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ: 4/14/32. On εὐαγγελίζειν see Dalman, *Worte* 84-87 and Conzelmann, *Luke* 221f. X\* changed τὴν βασιλείαν to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

<sup>17</sup>Even though it is not a strong argument, we may point out that in v.35 the reference to Jesus' prayer uses the contracted form κα'κεῖ while in v.38 we find the non-contracted form, and if the former is due to Mk then the latter may be pre-Mkan.

<sup>18</sup>A,Θ and the Koine group changed ἀπεστάλην to ἀπέσταλμαι and this lesson was adopted by von Soden.

<sup>19</sup>Eg. to Mk.1,31; 3,31; 5,1; 11,27b; cf. Cadbury, *Style* 177f.

<sup>20</sup>W, Ferrar and O90 read ἐλήλυθα, while A,D,Koine and Lake, 0104, 0130 read ἐξεληλυθα; they remove the ambiguity.

removed any ambiguity, since ἐξῆλθον leaves the reader with the question "whence?" That Mk did not understand the sense of ἐξῆλθον very well may be the reason why he preserved it. Finally, Lk has substituted the causal γάρ in Mk for ὅτι, as he does for instance to Mk.1,22.27; 6,35.36.<sup>21</sup>

The clauses of the pericope Mk.1,35-38/Lk.4,42f, relevant for our understanding of the final logion, which we have analyzed, suggest that Mk has preserved almost faithfully his source. Lk changed it in view of a stronger Christological orientation. The pre-Mkan form of these clauses ran:

- v.35                   ... ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς  
καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον
- v.36-37               .....
- v.38                   καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,  
ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχού εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις,  
ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω  
εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον.

#### B. The Earliest Reachable Form.

On the basis of the above established pre-Mkan form of the clauses relevant to our study, we may attempt to recover its earliest form. This may be done by observing the tensions, doublets and "theologizations" in these. I am well aware that the more one attempts to return to the times of the earthly Jesus, and to the earliest form of an account, the more hypothetical the conclusions become because the ground is extremely "slippery". It is my contention that the most primitive account was oral, simple, and quite neutral.

1. The Departure: v.35. The indication that Jesus went to an ἔρημος τόπος is possibly an addition made by pre-Mk. Its sharp contrast with the crowds (and the town) renders it suspicious. The use of two composites of ἔρχεσθαι strengthens this suspicion: ἀπῆλθεν is undoubtedly related to εἰς ἔρημον τόπον and can be understood as having served to introduce it. The same relationship is to be found in Mk.6,32 (καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ'ἰδίαν). Furthermore, if we observe the

<sup>21</sup>Lk's choice of ὅτι may well have been "to secure closer relation" with the precedent; see Cadbury, Style 139. Lk's ἐπὶ τοῦτο is certainly finer than Mk's εἰς τοῦτο, on which see ibidem 204.



other uses of this expression, in Mk.1,45 and 6,31f.35,<sup>22</sup> we notice that in all cases it stands in contrast with the crowds and is the place of reflection. This clause may therefore have been introduced with a pedagogical purpose.<sup>23</sup> One may also wonder whether it was not meant to serve as an inclusio with v.45. Hence, we may assume that the oldest account did not contain the clause καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον.<sup>24</sup>

2. The Reason Given: v.38. In the climaxing logion we find the following doublet: ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις.<sup>25</sup> Even though one might be tempted to conclude that because here we have three hapax legomena it belongs to the oldest tradition, it is evident that εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις is explicative of ἀλλαχοῦ.<sup>26</sup> If we stop for a moment to scrutinize the phrase about Jesus' intention to go to preach, our suspicions about εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις might be cleared.

The reference to preaching must have been absent in the primitive account because the term κηρύσσειν was, though loosely, a terminus technicus for preaching the Good News and was used especially in the Mkan tradition. Furthermore, the inclusive καί presupposes a wider context, viz. one in which it was known that Jesus had actually been assiduously preaching; it implies an a posteriori knowledge that he had been doing so,

<sup>22</sup>In 6,35 the reference is simply to a desolate place. If we place all the uses of ἔρημος τόπος in line, we observe that while in 1,35 Jesus could still be alone there, and in 1,45 and 6,31f the crowds make this more difficult, in 6,35 Jesus can no longer be alone. Is here a designed crescendo?

<sup>23</sup>An ἔρημος τόπος, which is not necessarily a desert --certainly not in Galilee-- is an uninhabited, empty place, thus contrasting with the crowds --and the city. On the whole see G. Kittel, art. ἔρημος, in TDNT II, 657f.

<sup>24</sup>B and 28 omitted ἀπῆλθεν, and W and it. omitted ἐξῆλθεν; cf. also Mk.6,1(D) and 14,45. See further Turner, "Commentary" 155, Pesch, "Ein Tag" 264, Best, Temptation 26, as well as Schmidt, Rahmen 58.

<sup>25</sup>A κωμοπόλις is a city having the status of a village; cf. Strabo xii,2.6; also E. Schürer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes II, Leipzig 1907, 227. It is absent in the LXX, but broadly corresponds to the כפר in contrast with the כפר.

<sup>26</sup>Haenchen, Weg 93, considers it to be a gloss. The adv. ἀλλαχοῦ strictly means "in another direction", but in NT times the distinction between "where" and "whither" had vanished, as pointed out in Bl-D §103. By itself it is too vague and therefore calls for an explicitation, which was provided by pre-Mk's addition "to the neighbouring villages". Ἀλλαχοῦ could hardly have been added later: for what purpose?

at least after his visit to the town in question (Capharnaum?), as καὶ ἐκεῖ underlines. On the other hand, the general context presents Jesus as a thaumaturge and it was because of his miracles that he had been sought out. Pre-Mk would have felt it necessary to include the reference to preaching in order to avoid leaving the impression that Jesus only concentrated on miracles and forgot about preaching. For these reasons we may assume that the reference to preaching originated with pre-Mk.<sup>27</sup>

Now, if εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις is dependent on and closely tied to the clause on preaching --as is evidenced by καὶ ἐκεῖ-- and the latter was absent from the oral tradition, then the former most probably was also absent from it.<sup>28</sup>

Finally, the expression εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον is also closely related to the clause about preaching, as indicated by the relational εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ("for this reason"). If I am correct in saying that the preaching clause was not included in the primitive account, then its dependent clause was also absent from it. If Jesus already stated that he was going elsewhere --excluding the town from which he just left-- the expression εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον would be purposelessly stating the obvious!<sup>29</sup>

Taken by itself, Jesus' reply and invitation, ἄγωμεν ἀλλὰ-  
χοῦ, was a sufficient confirmation of what the one(s) who sought and found him probably suspected, viz. that he had set his mind on leaving town. This could have been the oldest ending of this souvenir of Jesus.

### C. Form and Formative Factors.

The pericope, as it was bequeathed to us, presents a very

---

<sup>27</sup>Same conclusion reached by Pesch, "Ein Tag" 266.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Haenchen, *Weg* 93.

<sup>29</sup>Pesch, in *art.cit.* 266, contends that, even though the preaching-clause did not belong to the primitive account, the ἐξῆλθον-clause did belong to it because it corresponds to ἐξ-  
ῆλθεν in v.35. However, I fail to see how one could satisfactorily tie v.38d and v.38b (which for Pesch was primitive in its doublet form) without including v.38c. Furthermore, ἐξ-  
ῆλθον, first person sing., refers exclusively to Jesus while ἄγωμεν, first person plural, includes those to whom Jesus addresses himself. Hence, would one have to read "let us go elsewhere, that is why I came out/left"? See further Wichelhaus, "Am Ersten Tage" 57.

simple structure:

narrative:

- v.35: setting: spatio-temporal indications that introduce the story and link it with the preceding one;  
 v.36f: action: (Jesus left). A search and finding of Jesus. He is appreciated as a thaumaturge but his real intention is misunderstood.

pronouncement:

- v.38: reaction: Jesus points out his real mission: to preach (everywhere?).

From this schema one can observe that we are dealing with a mild form of a conflict story (departure-stay!-can't stay!). While the crowds want to retain Jesus in Capharnaum he refuses to comply because, as his reply implies, his mission cannot be confined to one particular place. While the crowds go after Jesus because of his miracles, he points out that his mission is that of preaching and there is no mention of miracles in his reply, i.e. his mission is not that of a settled thaumaturge but rather that of a wandering/itinerant preacher. There is also a dramatic crescendo: from a simple neutral action of going to a deserted place to an active search of the wonder-worker, thus provoking an emphatic reply on his part as if he were unsatisfied with them.

The main point of this brief story is provided by Jesus' reply to those seeking him. The logion of v.38 contains a double saying: the first half mentions Jesus' intention to go elsewhere in order to preach, while the second half gives the ultimate reason that lies behind this intention, viz. that he has a mission to carry out, a God-entrusted task to accomplish. The logion could hardly have had an independent existence because it is of such a nature that it requires a context to support it and give it a sense. Likewise, the story without the logion is pointless. Thus, in view of the mutual dependence between logion and narrative, we cannot say that one was "constructed" in view of the other.<sup>30</sup>

The Primitive Recollection. If we take into account the reason that most probably moved the crowd's search for Jesus, viz. his miracles, as well as the probable absence of the preaching

---

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Bultmann, ST 69, and Pesch, "Ein Tag" 268.

motive, one has the impression that the story originally presented Jesus in his dimension of a thaumaturge. The presentation of Jesus as a preacher, in v.38c, corresponds to that of v.21f (!) and seems to have been a consideration introduced at a later stage (pre-Mk) in order to point out that Jesus' ministry consisted not only in working miracles but also (and, indeed especially) of preaching.<sup>31</sup> It is to be noted that in its primitive stage it presents no particular Christological emphasis: we have a very simple story that can be thought to be close to the historical Jesus, containing a historical core. It was a "biographical" paradigm, preserved because it pointed out the universalism of Jesus' mission.<sup>32</sup>

Some Observations on the Context and Origin of Mk.1,35-38 par.

The most primitive account could hardly have existed isolated since it had no interest in itself,<sup>33</sup> but may have been part of a village's<sup>34</sup> folkloric tale about the thaumaturge Jesus who came but refused to settle there. Pre-Mk, when he arranged the material he possessed, placed this pericope (embellishing it) where he did in order to serve as a bridge between the beginning of Jesus' ministry in a fixed city (his workings there having been developed as a sample of his multiple activities) and its actual broadening to the whole of Galilee.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup>Similarly Pesch, "Ein Tag" 268; Schmidt, Rahmen 59.

<sup>32</sup>For Bultmann, ST 135, followed by Sundwall, Zusammensetzung 10, Schreiber, Theologie 102, Wichelhaus, "Am Ersten Tage" 61, and Kuhn, Sammlungen 17f, this pericope is totally editorial. They provide, however, no solid reasons nor show a detailed study of the pericope. Gaboury, Structure 125, does give some good reasons for taking a similar perspective but one may ask him whether it is not easier to think that Mt omitted it (cf. n. 3, above) than that Mk created it. Klostermann, Mk 19, hesitates.

<sup>33</sup>Lohmeyer, Mk 42, and Grundmann, Mk 48, suppose an original independent existence of the pericope.

<sup>34</sup>Whether or not it is Capharnaum is uncertain (cf. Pesch, art.cit. 274; for Schürmann, Lk 256, it centered on Nazareth) but what seems certain is that v.35-38.40-45 constituted one block: v.35 introduces a change in scenario and, in v.35 and 45 the ἐν πολεὶ is mentioned as a sort of inclusio. See the detailed analysis of Pesch, art.cit. 262. Schürmann, Lk 256, expresses the opinion that v.38 originally preceded the Nazareth pericope (Lk.4,16-30/Mk.6,1-6). For Gaboury, op.cit. 124-134, the original core had been the summary statement of v.39!

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Kuhn, op.cit. 18 n.22, and Boismard, Synopse 99, as well as Lohmeyer, Mk 44.

The origin of this account is, in my opinion, to be found in an ancient tradition<sup>36</sup> tied to a village (Capharnaum?),<sup>37</sup> which recalled Jesus' wonderful deeds, and was passed on till it reached our evangelists through pre-Mk. For a number of scholars it goes back to a personal recollection of Peter, on account of the special mention of Simon in Mk.<sup>38</sup>

D. The Meaning of ἔξηλθον in Mk.1,38 and Lk's Ἀπεστάλην.

1. From the Oldest Reachable Form to Pre-Mk.

We had concluded that in the most original account the reference to Jesus' intention to go to preach and the phrase εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἔξηλθον were absent. We also pointed out that in the earliest tradition of this pericope Jesus was remembered as a wonder-worker. Pre-Mk considered this appreciation of Jesus to be incomplete and misleading; consequently v.38c (and v.38d) was introduced as a corrective: Jesus was not just a thaumaturge but primarily "a preacher". Thus v.37b was introduced to occasion the reaction of Jesus which gives the reason for his departure from town (v.38cd).

Within the pre-Mk frame, ἔξηλθον had no Christological significance but served a paradigmatic purpose: the mission of preaching is not to be confined to any particular geographical area. Since here Jesus is presented as speaking to those whom he had called not long before and who admired him mostly for his miracles, these would hardly have understood ἔξηλθον in a sense other than that clearly expressed in v.35, viz. going out of town.<sup>39</sup> The ἔξηλθον-clause is an intentional accentuation of the obvious: "I have gone out of town in order to go to preach in other towns as well." For this reason pre-Mk also explicated ἀλλαχοῦ in v.38b by adding εἰς τὰς ἐχόμενας κωμοπόλεις.

<sup>36</sup>Thus also Lohmeyer, Mk 42, 44; Johnson, Mk 50; Pesch, "Ein Tag" 273; Marxsen, Mark 61.

<sup>37</sup>See n.34, above.

<sup>38</sup>Thus Swete, Mk 26; Cranfield, Mk 88; Branscomb, Mk 36; Lagrange, Mk 27; Taylor, Mk 182; Schmid, Mk 48; Grundmann, Mk 48; Schweizer, Mk 30; Knox, Sources I, 33; Jeremias, NTTh I, 91.

<sup>39</sup>This is all the more so if we consider the high probability that ἔξηλθον was inspired on the Vorlage's ἔξηλθεν of v.35, with which it constituted an inclusio.

## 2. The Interpretation of the Markan Final Redactor.

The final redactor allows us to perceive his understanding of the ἐξηλθον-clause by the retouches and additions he made to his source and the uses of the verb ἐξέρχεται elsewhere.

a. Jesus' Prayer. The most noteworthy change is the introduction of the praying Jesus in v.35. This occurs in Mk almost always at a critical moment, when an important decision is at stake. As he prayed in Gethsemani (14,32f.39), at the end of his public ministry and before definitely taking over the weight of the Passion, so also here before he fully takes over the weight of his public ministry. On both occasions it is a submission to God's will that follows. It is important to note that Mk introduced this indication (κακεῖ προσήύχeto) between his secret departure and the verbal confirmation of his decision, and not after the latter --in this manner Mk suggests that Jesus' decision responds to a divine ordinance: he had consulted God in prayer.<sup>40</sup> The response put on Jesus' lips in v.38 reflects, therefore, the Church's understanding of Jesus' prophetic mission as one willed by God and freely undertaken by Jesus.

b. Uses of ἐξέρχεται Elsewhere in Mk. From the uses of the verb ἐξέρχεται made by Mk, a more precise understanding of the sense of the same in 1,38 becomes possible. This is necessary because in 1,38 ἐξηλθον, which is used absolutely, is imprecise: we are not told whence he came forth. Such an undetermined use of ἐξέρχεται is also found in 4,3 and in 6,34. In none are we told whence he came out.

In Mk.4,3 the Parable of the Sower opens thus: ἰδοὺ ἐξ-

---

<sup>40</sup>See also Best, Temptation 136f. It is noteworthy that the prayer is said to have taken place in an ἐρημος τόπος, a lonely place, away from the crowds. As in other occasions, it does not take place in the full light of day. The ἐρημος τόπος has also a theological significance: for the prophets it was the place of encounter with God; cf. Schreiber, Theologie 168f, and Wichelhaus, "Am Ersten Tage" 54. The imperfect, προσήύχeto may indicate either a customary practice of Jesus, or it may be that he was absorbed in prayer when "Simon and those with him" found him. Both are plausible, and we will not get lost in such details. On the whole, there is a touch of hiddenness in Jesus' secret departure to a deserted place, which recurs in v.45: it precedes an open manifestation and may have served the Mkan "Messianic Secret" motif. This is by far more striking in Mk's than in Lk's version.

ἦλθεν ὁ σπείρων σπείραι; we know that the σπείρων is none other than Jesus (cf. 4,14). In 6,34 we learn that Jesus "ἐξελθὼν saw a great crowd;" it was from the ἔρημος τόπος (v.32) that he came out --note the similarity 6,32-1,35b, 6,33-1,36f, and 6,34-1,38d. In these two cases, as in those where we find an imprecise ἐξέρχεται but with respect to someone other than Jesus, viz. 1,45 and 6,12, the "going out" is in order to announce the Good News! Thus, ἐξέρχεται, used absolutely, means "to break out into the open" wide world. We find ourselves close to a possible answer to our query: ἐξέρχεται means leaving the hideness (cf.6,34!). A further clue is found in 4,3: the sower ἐξηλθεν, whence? from chez lui (!) and, --without pretending to say that Jesus' pre-existence is given implicit expression,-- we may suspect that it means "from the Father's house". Somewhat parallel is 6,12 wherein we are told that the disciples ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν, and if we were to ask whence they went forth we would have to think that it was "from Jesus' company" since the context gives no further hint. The same holds for the leper whom Jesus had cured and who ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν (1,45a).

c. The Meaning of Ἐξηλθον in Mk.1,38.

From the uses of ἐξέρχεται which we have considered and which contrast with others wherein the origin is either immediately specified (as in 8,27; 11,11.12) or easily known (as in 2,13; 6,1.34), we may assume that in 1,38 ἐξηλθον means more than just "I left town". To this purpose serves the addition of Jesus' prayer in v.35. However, it cannot be affirmed that ἐξηλθον means "from the Father", or some similar origin; nothing in our text allows us to draw such a conclusion --the more so if we realize that Mk's interest lies elsewhere.

From the general tenor of this pericope, it is not difficult to realize that Mk has preserved v.35-38 to indicate paradigmatically the universal mission of Jesus. This is further underlined by his inclusion of the summaries in 1,14.39; 2,13. In this perspective ἐξηλθον would have to be understood as implying "to do God's will", as the reference to his prayer suggests. God's will, i.e. the mission of Jesus, is to announce the nearness of the Kingdom, as the intimate relation between

the ἐξῆλθον-clause and the explicit statement ἵνα κηρεύω indicate. It is analogous to ἐξῆλθον κηρῦσαι, i.e. a purpose clause similar to the ἦλθον-logia! Κηρύσσειν is the mission Jesus was entrusted with by God and is the fundamental reason for his "going out of Nazareth" (1,9) and into Galilee at large. If κηρύσσειν is a God-entrusted mission, then ἐξῆλθον corresponds to it, and would read into Jesus' mind: "Because I am God's κήρυξ I am leaving the closedness of this place, as I left Nazareth, in order to make known God's salvific will throughout all of Galilee."<sup>41</sup>

If we observe the uses of ἔρχεσθαι in Mk.1, we cannot fail to notice that it is used in a number of passages that slowly build up to a climatic point in v.38. In 1,7 John the Baptist announces that ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερος; in 1,9 Jesus is said to ἦλθεν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ in order to be baptized, and in v.14 he finally ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ! In 1,28 it is his fame that spreads (ἐξῆλθεν) to all Galilee, and finally in 1,38 it is Jesus himself who announces that ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρεύω ἐξῆλθον, to those who sought to prevent his departure, to which Mk adds: καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων... εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων (v.39), the casting of demons being the eschatological (universal!) sign of the irruption of the Kingdom (cf. especially 1,24 and Lk.11,20).

There is no consensus among scholars about the most probable sense of ἐξῆλθον in v.38d. The disagreement is partly due to the ambiguity of the term itself, and partly to the failure to distinguish the various moments of tradition. For some it has the same meaning as ἀπεστάλιν does in Lk: sent by God or, come from heaven/God/the Father.<sup>42</sup> For others ἐξῆλθον has simply a motional sense, related to the ἐξῆλθεν of v.35.<sup>43</sup> Fi-

<sup>41</sup>Galilee, in the summaries of 1,14.39 is, for Mk, not just that geographically limited region of Palestine, but it is the place of Jesus' manifestation. It is there where he goes after the resurrection (14,28; 16,7), and it is from here that the universal mission begins (cf. 6,45-8,26). It contrasts with Jerusalem. See Marxsen, Mark c.III, Schreiber, Theologie 170-184 --but see the comments of W.G. Kümmel, in Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Heidelberg 1973, 60f.

<sup>42</sup>Swete, Mk 27; Klostermann, Mk 19; Schniewind, Mk 54; Schmid, Mk 48; Grundmann, Mk 48; Nineham, Mk 85; Hamerton-Kelly, Pre-Existence 48.

<sup>43</sup>Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 2; Jones, Mk 75; Gould ///



nally, some see it as unrelated to v.35 and pointing to Jesus' mission to preach.<sup>44</sup> The first opinion is hardly tenable for it reads into the text the idea of pre-existence; the view expressed by the second group corresponds to pre-Mk's and, that of the last group corresponds to that of the final redactor. Interesting is also the Christological interpretative change of ἐξῆλθον to (ἐξ)ελήλυθα in a number of MSS.<sup>45</sup>

To summarize: while for pre-Mk ἐξῆλθον had primarily a motional sense ("I left town") and served a didactic purpose, "Mark has in mind the mission of Jesus in Galilee: 'it was for that purpose I undertook my mission',"<sup>46</sup> as suggested by v.39. For Mk it translates the imperative to fulfil the task of preaching, which had been entrusted by God. It is highly doubtful that the Mkan tradition was thinking, at any moment, in terms of a pre-existing Jesus predestined by God to come to preach.

Having been absent in the earliest moments of the tradition of this story and, not being able to have an independent existence, it is evident that the ἐξῆλθον-clause did not originate in Jesus' mouth.

### 3. Luke's ἀπεστάλην.

Both, Mk and Lk, show a missionary concern, even if seen through different lenses: while Mk shaped the story ecclesio-logically, Lk did Christologically. The crowds seeking Jesus are introduced by Lk with a Christological purpose: they indirectly witness to Jesus' messiahship, even though they want him to do their will and not his will. Lk shaped v.42 in such a way as to bring out the logion of v.43 --this can already be observed in that almost half of the pericope is dedicated to the logion of Jesus.

Bu using the term ἀπεστάλην, which only recurs in Mt.

---

/// Mk 29; Rawlinson, Mk 19; Johnson, Mk 51; Branscomb, Mk 36; Pesch, "Ein Tag" 266; Turner, "Commentary" 156.

<sup>44</sup>Schmidt, Rahmen 58 (a "christologischer Terminus"); Lohmeyer, Mk 43; Cranfield, Mk 90; Taylor, Mk 184; Haenchen, Weg 93; Schweizer, Mk 30; Lightfoot, "Three Passages" 23; Schreiber, Theologie 100.

<sup>45</sup>See n.20, above.

<sup>46</sup>Taylor, Mk 184.

15,24, Lk has interpreted the ambiguous ἐξῆλθον.<sup>47</sup> Evidently, ἀπεστάλην leads to the question "by whom?" and the answer can only be obtained from the whole gospel as a background for this logion. An immediate answer is not given but discernible in the imperativial δεῖ, a particle which is used to express submission to God's will, viz. a divine charge or mission that is to be accomplished. It implies a pre-established plan and a road that one is compelled to follow.<sup>48</sup> Ἀπεστάλην has a prophetic implication: it is the prophet's claim to have been sent by God (cf. 4,18!).<sup>49</sup> Placed on the lips of Jesus, ἀπεστάλην implies the divine origin of his mission: he is the sent one. Among the different dimensions of Jesus that Lk wants to bring out, one stands out in particular: that of his fulfilment of God's promises, essentially that of sending a Messiah; Jesus is the long-awaited σωτὴρ sent by God. It is with this background that Lk's interpretative ἀπεστάλην has to be understood. As in 4,18 and 5,32, Lk gives in 4,43d a wider sense to the saying than Mk does: he refers this clause to the salvifico-historical totality of Jesus' ministry on earth as the promised one sent by God.<sup>50</sup>

The choice of the term ἀπεστάλην as interpretative of his source's ἐξῆλθον, responds to Lk's particular salvifico-historical (heilsgeschichtliche) understanding of Jesus as "die Mitte der Zeit". The logion, as shaped by Lk, underlines once more Jesus' mission as already announced in Isa.61,1f which Lk had cited in 4,18f: "The Spirit of God is upon me, for which sake he anointed me (ἐχρίσέν με) to evangelize the poor, he has sent me (ἀπέσταλκέν με) to...." It found concrete realization in Jesus' mission, as stated in 5,31f.

<sup>47</sup>Lk seems to interpret his source in many occasions, thus in 5,21.37; 6,13; 8,16.18.22; etc. For a list of these see de Solages, Composition 123ff. According to Jeremias, NTTh I, 13 n.1, the change made by Lk obeys to stylistic reasons only.

<sup>48</sup>Δεῖ is quite Lkian indeed: 8/6/19+25. On this see the excellent study by E. Fascher, "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ," in Neutestamentliche Studien (FS R. Bultmann), Berlin 1954, 228-254.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Isa.6,8; Jer.1,7; Ezek.2,3; Hag.1,12; Zech.2,15; 4,9; Mal.2,23. It is noteworthy that Lk has the prophets in mind more often than the other evangelists.

<sup>50</sup>See esp. Cadbury, Style 117f, and Schürmann, Lk 255.

Luke specifies Jesus' mission by providing the content of his preaching: τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. It is the first time that it occurs in this gospel. To assure the continuity and expansion of his mission, Jesus will call his disciples, and this, in Lk's gospel occurs immediately after our pericope -- this reveals most clearly his salvifico-historical optic.

Since none of these forms of the saying that concerns us, whether in Mk or in Lk, is an ipsissimum verbum Iesu, there is no question of a messianic consciousness.

### Conclusion.

The study of the saying we have just concluded revealed that the clause ἵνα ... κηρύξω ... ἐξέλθον was introduced by pre-Mk. It was added at this stage of tradition in order to counteract the impression that Jesus was primarily a thaumaturge. At that moment the meaning of ἐξέλθον did not differ from that of ἐξήλθεν in v.35a. Mk's addition of Jesus' prayer, and the observation of other uses of ἐξέρχασθαι in Mk, led us to suspect that RMk considered ἐξέλθον as meaning "to go into the open in order to proclaim God's salvific will everywhere."

Most interesting, however, proved to be Lk's change of ἐξέλθον to ἀπεστάλην: he gave it --as to the whole pericope-- a Christological orientation. It echoes back the citation of Isa.61,1f in 4,18f: Jesus is the expected final envoy of God. Together with the changes made by a number of MSS of ἐξήλθεν to (ἐξ)ελήλυθα, one should especially note the tendency to find a Christological meaning in the verb ἐρχεσθαι --it becomes the expression of Jesus' messiahship: he was sent by God, he is the definitive κήρυξ. The change from ἐξήλθον to ἀπεστάλην shows the kerygmatic movement within the early Church.

- - - - -

## II. DID YOU COME TO DESTROY US? Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34 and Mt.8,28/Mk.5,7/Lk.8,28.

The reaction of the demons to Jesus' presence is of interest to us inasmuch as we find there an explicit reference to Jesus' coming and the consequence his presence had for the demoniac world.

# A. Literary Considerations: Composition of the Demons' Reply.

Our literary analysis shall be rather brief, concentrating mostly on the demons' saying(s), in an attempt to discover the composing elements and if possible its earliest form. We shall first consider the two sayings (Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34 and Mt. 8,29 par.) separately and then compare them.

## 1. The Demoniac in the Synagogue: Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34.<sup>1</sup>

The demons' reply in the account of the healing of the possessed at the synagogue in Capharnaum is exactly the same in both Mk (1,24) and Lk (4,34). It is therefore impossible to determine a literary origin and dependence from these verses only; consequently we have to examine those framing them.

In v.23<sup>2</sup> we find the expression ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ: this is relatively frequent in Mk (2/11/5), while Lk's ἔχων...δαιμονίου, which is never found in Mk, recurs in Lk.4,35; 7,33 and 8,27.<sup>3</sup> If we turn to v.25, we observe that while Mk has the conversational ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, Lk has the smoother and better Gk, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ which is a literary improvement; it would be hardly thinkable that the inverse operation took place. While σπαράσσειν is not foreign to Lk (cf. 9,39/Mk.9,26), he seems to have nevertheless changed it for a term more to his liking and which is never found in Mk, viz. ῥιπτεῖν (3/0/2+3). In v.27, while Mk has ἐθαμβήθησαν (a verb only used in Mk, 3x!), Lk has the Semitizing expression ἐγένετο θάμβος (the noun recurs only in Lk.5,9 and Acts 3,10). Thus, from these observations we may assume that Lk depends literarily on a Mkan text. Sufficient redactional traits suggest that it was pre-Mk that served as a source to both, Mk and Lk.<sup>4</sup>

The demons' reaction in Mk.1,24 is most probably modelled

<sup>1</sup>Among the few studies of this pericope those made by R. Pesch, "Ein Tag vollmächtigen Wirkens Jesu in Kapharnaum," BLeb 9(1968), 116-128, and K. Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu im Markus-evangelium, Munich 1970, 50-60, are to be singled out.

<sup>2</sup>The Mkan versification is followed for simplicity sake.

<sup>3</sup>Lk mentions the δαιμόνιον very often: 9/11/21.

<sup>4</sup>Among the additions due to the final Mkan redactor we find εὐθύς, φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, Ταλιλαῖας. Pesch, art.cit. 118, considers it of pre-Mkan tradition. See further Boismard, Synopse 94ff.

on the reaction of the widow of Sarepta to the arrival of Elijah, i.e. on 1 Kgs.17,18 as a synopsis of these shows:

- | <u>Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34</u>                   | <u>1 Kgs.17,18</u>   |
|--|--|
| (a) τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ<br>Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ;   | τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ<br>ἄνθρωπε τοῦ Θεοῦ;   |
| (b) ἦλθες<br>ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; <sup>5</sup> | εἰσῆλθες πρὸς με<br>τοῦ ἀναμνησαί τὰς ἀδικίας μου<br>καὶ θανατῶσαι τὸν υἱόν μου; |
| (c) οἶδά σε τίς εἶ<br>ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.  |  |

This comparison is most instructive in many respects. The name of Jesus in the mouth of the demons and the defensive phrase οἶδά σε τίς εἶ is brought to our attention. The appellative ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ corresponds to ἄνθρωπε τοῦ Θεοῦ (later qualified as ἅγιος, in 2 Kgs.4,9).

The phrase οἶδά σε τίς εἶ is known from Greek magic papyri, and is not intended as a manifestation of knowledge but is rather a defensive formula,<sup>6</sup> as it was in 1 Kgs.17,18. It intends to keep the undesired one at a distance and thus guarantee self-protection from a menacing presence.<sup>7</sup> In its present form though, followed by the appellative ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the phrase serves as a confession formula.

The defensive clause in Mk.1,24c may well be an addition made to the original reaction of the demons. This is suggested by the Messianic secret theme to which it leads and the confessional form it has, as well as by a possible play on words. F. Mussner suggested that there is a play on words in Ναζαρηνέ and ἅγιος.<sup>8</sup> He remarked that in Jgs.13,7 and 16,17 the MT reads

<sup>5</sup>It is not certain whether it was meant as a question or a statement. In Bover's (Greek) text and the New English Bible it is a statement; otherwise always taken to be a question. A statement is what Taylor, Mk 174; Rawlinson, Mk 16; Lohmeyer, Mk 37f; Klostermann, Mk 20; Grundmann, Mk 41; and Schweizer, Mk 26, take it to be, and that is what I think is more probable.

<sup>6</sup>See Kertelge, Die Wunder 53, and H.J. Held, "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten," in Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium, Neukirchen 1960, 163.

<sup>7</sup>See further Jos.22,24; Jgs.11,12; 2 Sam.16,10; 19,23; 2 Kgs.3,13; 9,18f; 2 Chr.35,21; Jn.2,4. This is not an adjuration but a distantiating formula.

<sup>8</sup>"Ein Wortspiel in Mk 1,24?," BZ NF 4(1960), 285-6. See also E. Schweizer, "Er wird Nazoräer heißen," in Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche (FS J. Jeremias), Berlin 19642, 90-93. But see the objections of Taylor, Mk 177f.

נזיר אליהו, and was translated by MS A of the LXX as βασιλεῶν θεοῦ, and MS B as ὁ ἅγιος θεοῦ. This is explainable on the basis of the Hebrew 'רצ' = Ναζαρηνέ, which would echo 'ר'ן. Thus, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ could be "eine sachliche Interpretation" of (Ἰησοῦ) Ναζαρηνέ: it says who Jesus is.

The confessional form of the οἶδα σε clause and the consequent command to be silent (φιμώθητι, v.25a) are at the origin of the "Messianic Secret" motif. W. Wrede considered it to be the backbone of Mk's gospel. It can therefore be assumed that it was added to serve that motif. It should also be kept in mind that the demons call Jesus "son of God" in Mk.3, 11; 4,3.6 par.; 5,7 par.; and Lk.4,41, which is analogous to "the holy one of God" and may have been an influencing factor. Also noteworthy is the change in person from the plural (ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς) to the singular (οἶδα) in the same cry. The plural can be considered to correspond to the totality, the demoniac world, and the singular as being a confession of the possessed himself. This would, therefore, be an added indication of the posteriority of v.24c.<sup>9</sup> It is easier to explain the addition of v.24c than of Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ. The parallel to 1 Kgs.17,18, and the use of the name (= Semitic concept of power over the one whose name is used?), suggest v.24ab is more Palestinian than v.24c --which possibly is of Hellenistic origin. We may therefore assume that the original verbal reaction of the demons did not include the οἶδα σε clause (v.24c).

## 2. The Gerasene Demoniac: Mt.8,29/Mk.5,7/Lk.8,28.<sup>10</sup>

We shall now briefly consider the demon(s)' reaction to

<sup>9</sup>Scholars have attempted to explain these changes, which also occur throughout the story itself, in different manners. Taylor, *Mk* 174, considers it as dramatic effect; Lohmeyer, *Mk* 36, as the spokesman and representative of the group of demons; while Grundmann, *Mk* 43, and Schweizer, *Mk* 28, consider it to have been what we would call "schizophrenia". In  $\Sigma$  and  $\text{bo.}$  we read οἶδαμεν in Mk's text, and  $\Psi$  contains it in Lk's text. It seems to me that this change of persons deserves by far more attention than it has hitherto received.

<sup>10</sup>Detailed studies include H. Sahlin, "Die Perikope vom gerasenischen Besessenen," *ST* 18(1964), 159-172; K. Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu* 101-110; J.F. Craghan, "The Gerasene Demoniac," *CEQ* 30(1968), 522-536; Boismard, *Synopse* 199-208, and R. Pesch, *Der Besessene von Gerasa* (SBS 56), Stuttgart 1972, which includes a long bibliography.

Jesus' presence in the story of the Gerasene demoniac. Placing the three versions synoptically, alongside the reaction of the demons' of Capernaum, we obtain the following picture:

<u>Mt.8,29</u>	<u>Mk.5,7</u>	<u>Lk.8,28</u>	<u>Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34</u>
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν	καὶ κράξας	ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας προσεπέσεν αὐτῷ καὶ	καὶ ἀνέκραξεν
λέγοντες· τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί	φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγει τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί	φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί	φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί
υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ;	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ	Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ	Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ;
ἦλθες ὥδε πρὸ καιροῦ	τοῦ ὑψίστου;	τοῦ ὑψίστου;	ἦλθες
βασιανίσαι ἡμᾶς;	ὀρεκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μή με βασανίσῃς	δέομαί σου μή με βασανίσῃς	ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

At first sight the demon(s)' reaction appears as a doublet with that in the account of the demoniac of Capernaum. In fact, they are verbally and structurally (cf. §B) very close, not only in the demon(s)' reply but also in Jesus' rebuke and command; the demon(s)' violent reaction and departure, and the observation that "all were amazed". Furthermore, Mk.1,23f and 5,22ff show several points of probable literary contact: nowhere else in Mk do we read ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτω, τί ἐμοὶ/ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, and to cry φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (except at the cross, 15,37). The challenging reaction of the demon, as given in Mk/Lk shows a definite literary dependence either of one on the other or both on a common source, while Mt's differs considerably: it was reshaped by him.<sup>11</sup>

a. Mk.5,7 and Lk.8,28. As is frequently the case, Lk has changed his Mkan source's λέγει to εἶπεν. Lk uses the compound form ἀνακράξας, as he is so prone to do. In the demon's reply itself, we observe that while Mk has the rare ὀρεκίζω (0/1/0) Lk has a verb he uses several times and is never found in Mk, viz. δέομαι (1/0/7+7). Thus, the dependence would be of Lk on a Mkan text.

<sup>11</sup>For Lohmeyer, Mt 167, Mt's is a "selbständige Version," similarly for Grundmann, Mt 262f.

The Mkan embellishment of the description of the possessed, well beyond what Lk had before him (v.3-5), the reference to the sea in v.1, and the absence of the boat in Lk are some indications that Lk's source was not final-Mk.<sup>12</sup> It is interesting to note that the use of *μνῆμα* in Lk.8,27 comes also into use in 23,53 and 24,1, where Lk follows pre-Mk. Lk ignores the quantitative references of Mk.5,5.13, when he is very interested in numbers: did he know them?

b. Mk.5,7 and Mt.8,29. While Mt and Lk speak of a plurality of demons, Mk speaks in 5,1-10a of a unique demon, and in v. 10b-13 about a plurality. If at first sight this is striking, several other inconsistencies seem to indicate that Mk has mixed two different accounts --from two different sources. In v.1 Jesus is said to go to the region of Gerasa and in v.2 he disembarks from the boat; however, if Gerasa is the present day Jerash, some 35 miles east of the lake of Galilee, he could not have been in that region as soon as he disembarked. While in v.2 Jesus is met (*ὑπήντησεν*) by the demon possessed, in v.6 we are told that the man *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν* towards him! Not only do we find two forms of the noun "tomb", *μνημεῖον* (v.2) and *μνῆμα* (v.3.5), but also v.6 seems to introduce a new story: *καὶ ἰδὼν* + a first (?) encounter with Jesus.<sup>13</sup> Only after the demon has been ordered to leave (and did so: aor. *ἔξελθε*), does Jesus ask the demon for his name (v.9). The reply, "legion", probably serves to tie the accounts; only in v.12 are we formally informed that they leave the man.<sup>14</sup> Thus, Mk very probable used two accounts and conflated them so as to produce a unique story.<sup>15</sup> Mt's account is only in terms of two demons/demons and the whole is perfectly coherent. It is from here that one may suppose that a close relation exists between

<sup>12</sup>See further esp. Boismard, Synopse 201-206.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. D.H. Cave, "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits," NTS 11(1964/65), 94.

<sup>14</sup>See further the analysis made by Boismard, op.cit. 201ff, and Cave, art.cit. 94ff. Pesch, Der Besessene 14, is well aware of these and other incoherences but tries to explain them away.

<sup>15</sup>Pesch, op.cit. 16f, 49; Kertelge, Die Wunder 101f, as well as Bultmann, ST 210, and others, consider Mk's account to to preserve almost intact the original form of the story.



Mt's account and the pre-fusion Mkan account.

Mt has probably combined the story of Mk.1,23-26 (which he had omitted!) with the earliest story about one demoniac (Mk.5,1-10a); the combination performed in v.29 lends support to this hypothesis.<sup>16</sup> The story of the demons and pigs, on the other hand, may have been related not to Gerasa but to the land of the Gadarenes, S.E. of the lake of Galilee. A different story, the one about a man possessed by one demon and having nothing to do with the colorful story of the pigs, may have been located in the region of Gerasa.

c. The Oldest Form? The inquiry as to which might have been the oldest (reachable) form of the demon's reply in the story of the Gadarene demoniac still remains. Lk's is directly dependent on the Mkan one, as we have seen, and Mt's differs considerably from these.

The Mkan reaction of the demon shows no traces of redactional retouches and employs a vocabulary that is rather rare in Mk.<sup>17</sup> However, the qualificative τοῦ ὑψίστου may be an addition made by RMk under the influence of (pre?) Lk: as an appellative for God it is frequent in the Lkan gospel (0/1/5+2) and is absent in Mt.8,29.<sup>18</sup> The brevity --as the whole story-- and Christological concentration of the Mtan form can be explained as primarily due to RMt. ἡμῖν, in Mt, is necessary on account of his presentation of two demoniacs;<sup>19</sup> ἦλθες ( ) βασιλεῦσαι ἡμᾶς picks up Mk.1,24, a story he is integrating here, βασιλεῦσαι replacing ἀπολέσαι, and Ἰδοὺ πρὸς καιρὸν is added to make up for the adjuration which did not fit into the apocalyptic picture painted by Mt.<sup>20</sup> Thus, Mk.5,7, omitting τοῦ ὑψίστου, was the oldest form of the demon's reaction in this story.

<sup>16</sup>Similarly Boismard, *Synopse* 201-205; see also Pesch, *Der Besessene* 52.

<sup>17</sup>ὕψος (τοῦ) Θεοῦ : 9/4/6; δεκίζω: 0/1/0+1; ὑψιστος: 1/2/7+2; βασιλεύω: 3/2/1.

<sup>18</sup>Boismard, *op.cit.* 206, who also points out other Lucanisms. See also Acts 16,17 (also an exorcism!).

<sup>19</sup>According to T.A. Burkill, "Concerning Mk.5,7 and 5,18-20," *ST* 11(1957), 161, the fact that one has the sing. (ἐμοί) and the other the plural (ἡμῖν), implies that there was no direct contact between them but a common formula: 1 Kgs.17,18.

<sup>20</sup>Boismard, *op.cit.* 200, assigns Mt.8,29 to "Doc. A", on the basis of Epiphanius' version; Mk's had a different source.

### 3. The Earliest (Reachable) Form of the Demon's Reaction.

If one asks which, Mk.1,24 (minus the confessional οἶδά σε κτλ.) or Mk.5,7, is older, the answer would be the former. The reaction in Mk.5,7 is markedly impregnated with a Christological-confessional outlook: Jesus is "son of God" and this in the mouth of a pagan (!). It probably combines the two designations of Jesus in Mk.1,24 and hence would have known a later stage of Mk.1,24.<sup>21</sup> The adjuration, which one would expect in the mouth of the exorcist and not the demon, takes the place of οἶδά σε τίς εἶ; δέκω σε takes οἶδα σε τίς εἶ for granted. The confrontation is sharpened by the adjuration: it places God against God as if ironically wanting to take the side of God; it is no longer defensive but offensive. The verb βασανίζω is used for the end-time sufferings in apocalyptic descriptions (cf. Apoc.9,5; 11,10; 12,2; etc.; T.Asher 6,5). The request not to torment him presupposes the superiority of Jesus and the useless resistance of the demon. Mk.5,7 no longer mentions Jesus' coming: his presence itself is already a menace; moreover, ἦλθες would hardly have fitted because it was the man that approached Jesus --not so in Mt. Thus, the earliest form, if any, would have been:

τί ἡμῖν/ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρενέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς;

which brings us full circle back to the form of 1 Kgs.17,18!

### B. Form and Formation of the Demons' Verbal Reaction.

The verbal reactions we are studying all have the same basic structure:

1. the demon shouts (κράζειν );
2. begins by τί ἡμῖν / ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, and
3. Jesus is addressed by name, followed by
4. a rhetorical question or statement about their fate.

To these, tradition added a confession formula and a defensive cry (οἶδά σε τίς εἶ) or an adjuration formula (δέκω σε). The stable elements are also those found in what I presume was the earliest form of the demons' words. This form was found to be an adapted copy of 1 Kgs.17,18.

---

<sup>21</sup> Similarly Pesch, Der Besessene 25; see also Mk.1,1!

1. Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34, as bequeathed to us, are built in a crescendo: one passes from a precautionary distancing formula, through a recognition of the meaning of Jesus' presence, to an open confession of who he is; from "Jesus of Nazareth" to "the holy one of God". It became an open revelation of Jesus' hidden nature. This construction is not accidental, but Christologically intended. The opposition is in fact between the πνεῦμα (δαιμονίου) ἀκαθάρετου (v.23.27) and the ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>22</sup>

Whether the story is in its essence historical or not is of no importance for our study. What is certain is that the words of the demons --modelled on 1 Kgs.17,18-- are due to the early Church. The formative "setting in life" of these words was the catechetical interest: it shows the significance of the coming of Jesus of Nazareth, his God-given authority and superiority. He is the ἰσχυρός (cf. Mk.3,26 par.) who came to ἀπολέσαι the demoniac powers. At his coming (ἦλθες) the demons are compelled to leave (ἐξέλθε, v.25f; cf. also Lk.11, 24ff). In its final stage, v.24 served to underline the divine origin of Jesus, his messianity, through the addition of v.24c. The story of the expulsion of demons served to support the authority of Jesus and his "new teaching" (v.22,27). In a word, it did not cease to serve the catechetical interests of the Church.

2. Mk.5,7/Lk.8,28 had been Christologically oriented from the beginning: the first words we find are an open confession by the demoniac of Jesus' divinity: υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>23</sup> The recognition of the presence of Jesus was at the center of the story: it was an epiphany-account.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Noteworthy is the opposition ἀκάθαρτος-ἅγιος: two terms of cultural ring. The ἅγιος -clause may well have been added in order to bring out this opposition.

<sup>23</sup>It seems that v.8 was added later. Not only does it break the exchange between the demons and Jesus, but the impf. ἔλεγεν (γάε!) and the renewed mention of ἀκάθαρτος renders it most suspicious. Thus also Knox, Sources I, 40; Klostermann, Mk 49; Lohmeyer, Mk 35f; Bultmann, ST 210; Haenchen, Weg 197f; Schweizer, Mk 63; Kertelge, Die Wunder 102, and Schürmann, Lk 480, 487. To the contrary Pesch, Der Besessene 16, and Boismard, Synopse 202f.

<sup>24</sup>Lohmeyer, Mk 98; Kertelge, op.cit. 107. The epiphanic character comes to the fore when one compares the demoniac's confession with the heavenly words at Jesus' baptism and at ///

The formative "setting in life" of this story at first was catechetical, in the early Church: the sovereignty of Jesus, his presence is of such a nature that it brings about an open recognition even by the demons. Whether it was from its beginnings that the story was shaped out of missionary interests is not certain. Nevertheless, such an interest soon played a formative role: it is situated in a heathen land; the confession is in the mouth of the demoniac (a heathen!) himself; he kneels (προσεκύνησεν, v.6) before him --which contrasts with Lk.4,7,-- they are "legion" (v.9 -πολλοί ἐσμεν), and the cured demoniac is ordered to remain and proclaim what happened (v.19f). The thus constituted mission-story carried within it a lesson: go also to pagan lands, Christ is also acknowledged there, Jesus gave the example bringing salvation also to pagans.<sup>25</sup> It contains an implicit exhortation to broaden the mission field and to accept those coming from outside Judaism. We have a community composed of Gentile and Judeo-Christians, and the exhortation was probably intended for the latter.<sup>26</sup>

3. Mt.8,29 is a recognition of the epiphanic presence (ἦλθες) of the "son of God", supreme master and judge, clothed in the form of two rhetorical questions (cf. Mk.1,24ab). As we already indicated, it combines the demons' outcries in Mk.1,24 and 5,7 giving it a heavily concentrated Christological orientation.

The Christological concentration is observable not only in the demons' words themselves, but also in the story which has

---

/// the Transfiguration: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός -  
(i.e. Mk.1,11; 9,76 par.) Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ θεοῦ τοῦ ὁψίστου

<sup>25</sup>The epexegetic τοῦ ὁψίστου is a Palestinian circumlocution for God which was also in use in the Hellenistic communities (cf. Acts 16,17 [also an exorcism!]; Hebr.7,1). It is frequently used in the OT (יְיָ - cf. Gen.14,18.19.22; Num.24,16; Dt.32,8; 2 Sam.22,14; etc.). It is interesting to observe that in the OT it is frequent in the mouth of non-Israelites as a title for God. Finally, it is noteworthy that the expression τοῦ ὁψίστου corresponds to ἦλθες from heaven.

<sup>26</sup>The two confessions of the demons, Mk.1,24 par. and 5,7 par. take place in two different localities. The first in a synagogue in Capharnaum (hence Jewish!) and the second in heathen territory (hence Gentile!). The second was probably intended to complement the first. Note that 5,7 is based on and expands Mk.1,24, and thus, in its limited way, shows the universalism of Christ's presence, contrary to any nationalistic concern.

been reduced to the essential, in function of the picture of Christ as lord over demons.<sup>27</sup> The confrontation is short and sharp: the demons know themselves doomed (πρὸ καιροῦ); just a word of Jesus (ὑπάγετε, v.32a) and they run to their destruction (ἀπέθανον, v.32d). The two pillars of the story are introduced by καὶ ἰδοὺ (v.29a.32c).

The formative "setting in life" of Mt's account is therefore evidently catechetical: it paints Christ's supremacy over the demoniac world and his authority to judge and "split" the aeons.<sup>28</sup> The missionary concern of Mk/Lk is absent in Mt, who concentrates on the Christological; Jesus was even asked to μεταβῆ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν. For Mt the time of the mission outside Israel breaks into the open only with the resurrection (compare 10,6 and 15,24 with 28,19).

Because the demons' words in the three versions we have just considered contain a confessional formula, they are loaded with theological considerations which proceed from a reflection of the relation between Christ (risen!) and the demoniac powers. There can be no doubt that these originated in the early Church.<sup>29</sup>

### C. The Significance of ἡλθες.

In both, Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34 and Mt.8,29, ἡλθες undoubtedly refers to the presence of Jesus which the demons see in itself as a menace to their security. However, we must ask for the particular nuances ἡλθες has in these verbal reactions.

1. In Mk.1,24/Lk.4,34 ἡλθες had from its beginning an eschatological significance besides the local one. The local sense,

<sup>27</sup>See the observations esp. of H.J. Held, "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten," in Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium, Neukirchen 1960, 162ff, and Pesch Der Besessene 51-56.

<sup>28</sup>The global outlook of the demoniac world in Mt's mind can be read from the adj. πολλῶν (v.30; Mk: μεγάλη) and πάντα (v.32c; absent in Mk/Lk). πρὸ καιροῦ implies a recognition that Jesus had this power to destroy them even before he came. The expression πρὸ καιροῦ is a messianic reference to the end-times, when the Satanic powers are overcome by the Messiah: see Jud. 10,8f; Isa.24,22f; En.15f; 1 En.49,27; T.Juda 25; T.Levi 18; Ass.Moses 10,1; Jub.23,29f; Lk.4,13; 10,18; Apoc.20,10.

<sup>29</sup>Cranfield, Mk 76f, however maintains that the demons' reply is historical!

which predominated at its inception, can be deduced from (1) the first rhetorical question, which was conceived to show a warding off the one intending to impose his will (cf. 1 Kgs. 17,18), and (2) the fact that the story belonged to a cycle of accounts about the itinerant mission of Jesus, whose power is shown in this account in a most forceful manner. The eschatological dimension is observable in the fact that it is Jesus' presence which is the cause of the demons' irritation and, followed by the infinitive of purpose ἀπολέσαι, it suggests to the reader the apocalyptic representation of a decisive confrontation between two powers --an eschatological war. The naming of Jesus of Nazareth indicates that ἦλθες pointed to his concrete, historical coming. By the addition of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ it is the epiphanic character of his coming that is brought to the fore, i.e. the presence of God through Jesus. While the demons cry ἦλθες κτλ., Christ's command is ἔξελθε ἐξ (αὐτοῦ)! The presence of the two is incompatible and the stronger one remains.

Ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς, similar in form to some of our ἦλθον - sayings (Lk.12,49; 19,10), is programmatic: it says what Jesus came for, and looks back from the standpoint of the Resurrection, at the totality of his activity and mission as destructive to the demons' unchallenged power. Ἦλθες + inf. means in itself "is your purpose to ...?" but in the light of the story it means more than that because the cause of the demons' cry is Jesus' presence, i.e. the fact that he came, and his coming brings along the menace of destruction for them. This is all the more clear once we consider 1 Kgs.17,18. In a word, ἦλθες has an epiphanic sense. Even though it is not said whence he came, it is evidently his divine origin, his "with-Godness" that is suggested by the addition of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

2. In Mt.8,29 ἦλθες preserves, as was the case in Mk.1,24/Lk. 4,34, the local and an eschatological aspect which ἔρχεσθαι often has. The local sense is brought to light by the spatial adv. ὧδε, whereby Mt seems to want to underline the reality of the event and of Jesus' presence. The eschatological character of ἦλθες can be deduced not only from the Christological orientation Mt gives to the pericope, but already from the apocalyp-

tic πρὸ καιροῦ (see n.28). Likewise, ἦλθες ( ) βασιλείσαι ἡμᾶς is programmatic and constitutes the heart of Mt's presentation, which has as main topic the lordship of Christ over the demons.

The divine origin of Jesus is assumed in the defensive-turned-confessional τί ἡμῖν κτλ. cry, as well as in the πρὸ καιροῦ expression. It is not impossible that the awareness of Jesus' pre-existence floats in the background of the demons' outcry. That ἦλθες ( ) πρὸ καιροῦ βασιλείσαι ἡμᾶς refers to Jesus' messiahship is doubtful for it was not the Messiah but God himself who, according to current Jewish conceptions,<sup>30</sup> would definitely overcome the demoniac and all evil powers.

### Conclusion.

In the uses of ἐρχεσθαι by the demons, which we have just considered, it became evident that ἦλθες + inf. has a very concrete local sense along with a deeper eschatological one. It means more than just "is your purpose/mission to ...?" It refers primarily to the epiphanic coming and presence of the long-awaited final envoy of God whose coming corresponds to a specific purpose: to inaugurate the period of the Kingdom of God. He can therefore say "if I cast the demons out by the finger (Mt: spirit) of God, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you" (Lk.11,20/Mt.12,28; cf. 1 Jn.3,8) --with his coming comes the Kingdom of God, indication of which is the fate acknowledged by the demoniac powers.

- - - - -

### III. THE SON OF MAN CAME EATING AND DRINKING: Mt.11,16-19/ Lk.7,31-35.

This pericope, which constitutes the final witness of Jesus to John the Baptist, is the third in a group of sayings about the Precursor.<sup>1</sup> It is occasioned by John's inquiry about the mission of Jesus (Mt.11,2ff/Lk.7,18ff), and follows Jesus' solemn attestation that the Baptist was he whom Malachi

<sup>30</sup>See Billerbeck II, 167f; IV/1, 527.

<sup>1</sup>The following studies deal especially with this pericope: F. Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte Kairos," Bib 40(1959), 599-613; R. Leivestad, "An Interpretation of Matt 11:9," JBL 71(1952), 179-181; as well as in Hoffmann, Logienquelle '96, 196f, 224-231; Lührmann, Logienquelle passim; Schulz, Q 379-386; Suggs, Wisdom 33-57.

(3,1) had prophesied that would come as precursor of the Messiah. The whole section about John the Baptist (Mt.11,2-19/Lk.7,18-35) is absent in Mk, and the close resemblances of the texts of Mt and Lk indicate that either they had a common source (Q) unknown to Mk, or one used the which the other had received from a special source. The general setting in both gospels is Messianic, but each paints it in his own way.<sup>2</sup>

#### A. Literary Analysis.

##### 1. The Parable and its Application: A Unity?

At first sight v.16-19<sup>3</sup> constitute a perfect unity: a parable followed by an explicative application. However, on closer analysis one has reason to doubt whether or not the two were always together, and whether the explanation was not linked to the parable by the early Church. The following observations are indicative:

(i) In v.16f the introduction to the parable, the rhythmic complaint of the children,<sup>4</sup> the description of Palestinian customs, are very Semitic (cf. infra). V.18f are quite Hellenistic: δαιμόνιον ἔχειν, φάγος, φίλος, ἀμαρτωλοί.

<sup>2</sup>In Mt: the Baptist heard of the ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ (11,2); Jesus announces that JnB is the expected Elijah, closing the prophetic era (11,12-14); in fact, he delimitates the eschatological times. Our pericope is followed by the pronouncement of the woes against the Galilean cities (11,20-24) because they did not recognize his δύναμις and did not convert (v.20). That Lk also paints a Messianic background can be observed in the explanation he introduces in 7,21 so as to leave out any doubts that the prophecy of Isa.29,18f was actually accomplished in Jesus' great deeds --thus explicating what Mt meant to say with τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ in 11,2;-- the addition of v.29f, esp. τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ. In Lk our pericope is followed by the forgiveness of the sinful woman during the meal at Simon the Pharisee (cf. esp. v.39 and 49b). Both Mt and Lk, include the references to Isa.29,18f as Jesus' answer to John's query about him and as Jesus' witness to JnB. These references to Isa. are messianically understood.

<sup>3</sup>For the sake of simplicity the versification in Mt is followed as long as there is no need to specify Lk's.

<sup>4</sup>Black, Aramaic 161, points out the rhythmic parallelism preserved in the Peshitta and Old Syriac, for v.17:

z<sup>e</sup>marn l<sup>e</sup>khon wela raqqedhton  
wē'lain l<sup>e</sup>khon wela 'arqedhton.

Jeremias, in NTTh I, 26, sees the following "kina" (3+2) meter in Aramaic:

z<sup>e</sup>mánnan l<sup>e</sup>kón wēlā raqqēdtūn  
'alēnan wēlā 'arqēdtūn.

This not only suggests its Semitic origin, but also its antiquity.



(ii) The parable is concerned with the general attitude of "this generation"; not so v.18f which centers on "reception" accorded to Jesus and his precursor.

(iii) V.18f use the parable allegorically, which was not its original purpose (cf. infra).

(iv) While v.17 paints two different pictures (v.17a.b.: wedding - funeral), v.18f use only one (eating-drinking). If the whole was a unity from the beginning why did not v.17 use only one picture, such as ἡυλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὤεχῆσασθε, οὐκ ἡυλήσαμεν καὶ ὤεχῆσασθε ?

Thus, in view of these observations, we are justified in suspecting that the parable (v.16f) and its application (v.18f) had originally a separate existence.<sup>5</sup> Whether they already constituted a unity before they reached the final redactors can only be concluded after completing our literary analysis of the whole pericope.

According to P. Hoffmann v.18f were probably appended to the parable in order to serve as an explanation (note the explicative γάρ in v.18a) at a time when the parable was no longer understood.<sup>6</sup> However, it is also possible that it was the parable that was introduced here to serve as a backbone to the explanation for the rejection of JnB and of Jesus. The parable, which most probably did have a separate existence, is messianic in tone and therefore fitted best here, in this messianic context. It is to be noted that Mt.11,2-11/Lk.7,18-28 present Jesus' witness to John the Baptist, as do Mt.11,18f par. (!); the parable is the one element that is foreign in this context.

## 2. The Parable: Literary Analysis.

The parable is introduced in Lk by a double question; only the first of these is found in Mt. In the first question, τί νὶ ὁμοιώσω ..., Lk has added τοὺς ἀνθρώπους<sup>7</sup> in order to specify

<sup>5</sup>Thus also Bultmann, ST 172, 199; Klostermann, Mt 99; Hahn, Hoheitstitel 44 (vs. Schweizer, "Menschensohn" 199f); Hoffmann, Logienquelle 224f; Lührmann, Logienquelle 29; Schulz, Q 381; cf. also Teeple, "The Origin" 235. Perrin, Rediscovering 86, holds that while v.16f is Jesus' v.18f is not, but in p.120f he holds that v.16-19 were a unity from the beginning!

<sup>6</sup>Logienquelle 227.

<sup>7</sup>That seems to be the unanimous opinion of the exegetes. However Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas 286 thinks that Mt ///

and vivify τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, as in 11,31, and possibly also to make the rejection of Jesus, as an ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, by his contemporaries more striking. It is of no vital importance to our study to know whether Lk has added the second question or Mt omitted it (which seems to me more probable than that Lk added it).<sup>8</sup>

Luke's ἐν ἄγορᾷ (ῥιου), is more primitive than Mt's generalizing plural ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς.<sup>9</sup> However, Lk has replaced the verb (καθημένους) in accordance with good Greek syntax. Noteworthy is Mt's change of ἀλλήλοις (in Lk) to τοῖς ἑτέροις. That it was Lk who has kept the original can be deduced from the observation that Lk quite often uses ἑτέρος (8/0/33+17)<sup>10</sup>

/// omitted it. Harnack, Sprüche 17, calls it "Eine stilistische, aber pedantische Verbesserung"! It can hardly be said that Mt omitted it since he uses this noun proportionately as often as Lk does, and there is no compelling reason for his wanting to omit this vivifying term.

<sup>8</sup>Klostermann, Lk 91; Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas 286; Jülicher, Gleichnisreden 24; Grundmann, Mt 311; Hoffmann, Logienquelle 196, and Schulz, Q 379, consider Lk's double question as primitive. However, Hirsch, Frühgeschichte II, 93, Boismard, Synopse 168, and Schweizer, Mt 169, are of the opinion that it was Lk who added the 2d question. In this respect it should be observed that (1) Lk tends to avoid rhetorical questions (cf. Cadbury, Style 81); (2) the other examples of a similar formula, viz. Lk.6,47/Mt.7,24 and Lk.13,20/Mt.13,33, indicate that either Lk adds or Mt omits the question, but Lk.13,18/Mt.13,31/Mk.4,30 suggests that it is Mt who avoids the use of this type of question --not the contrary. It is to be noted that in Lk.13,20/Mt.13,33 not only Mt has no question but he uses the same formulation he has been using in c.13 to introduce the parables. It must be pointed out that it is bad methodology to argue that simply because this form of question recurs in Lk, in 13,18 and esp. 13,20 (see also 6,47), then that in 7,31 must a fortiori be due to him. The parallel(s) must also be considered, the uses of Mt also be studied, and the question of a possible avoidance by its parallel (Mt) must be considered as a real possibility. Finally, (3) this question reflects the Semitic formula הוֹרֵר הַבֵּר הַזֶּה לְפָנֶיךָ when translated into Greek (cf. Billerbeck II, 8, for other examples of this usage in Rabbinic literature; see further Zerwick, Greek 965; Jeremias, Parables 100ff). It should furthermore be observed that Lk, contrary to Mt, tends to preserve the question or questions introducing a parable whenever they are found in his source. In fact, Mt never introduces a parable with a question, except in 18,12 and 21,28, both with a formula of his own: τὸ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; and only here does he introduce a parable with the formula τίς ὁμοιώσω ..., which means that it is a formula not due to him but to his source. The double question, as Lagrange, Lk 222, points out, is typical Rabbinic.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Hoffmann, op.cit. 197, and Schulz, Q 379. The parables begin eg. "a man -not, when men!- went out to sow...."

<sup>10</sup>Ἀλλήλοις : 2(24,10; 25,32: no par.)/5/11+8.

and one may wonder if he would not have done so here if he had found it in his source. Moreover, τοῖς ἑτέροις indicates that Mt understood v.16f in terms of v.18f and that he is probably echoing the messianically oriented ἕτερος of v.3.<sup>11</sup> Although Lk's ἀλλήλοις is better Greek than the more popular τοῖς ἑτέροις in Mt, it corresponds to the original sense of the parable.<sup>12</sup> While Mt introduces the children's rhyme with the impersonal λέγουσιν (to correspond to that of v.18.19?), Lk has preserved what is "most difficult as Greek"<sup>13</sup> but probably is a Semitism: ὁ λέγει (= 70x7).<sup>14</sup> In the complaint itself, as is generally recognized, Lk has changed the Palestinian ἐκόψασθε (Mt) to ἐκλαύσατε, a Hellenistic term more to his liking (2/3/11+3).<sup>15</sup>

From our analysis of the parable we may conclude that both depended on a written text, which probably read:

τίνι ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; καὶ τίνι ἐστὶν ὁμοία;  
ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδίῳ καθημένῳ ἐν ἀγορᾷ  
καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὁ λέγει·  
ἠύλησamen ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε  
ἐθηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε.

### 3. The Application: Literary Analysis of v.18f.

In the second part of this pericope, viz. v.18f, it can be asserted that the following differences reveal RLk's hand: (1) the change from the aor. ἦλθεν to the perf. ἐλήλυθεν (2x), as he did in 5,32 (par. Mk.2,17b/Mt.9,13).<sup>16</sup> (2) The addition

<sup>11</sup>Lk has instead ἄλλον (v.19b.20c). It is to be noted that both adj. were often confused in the Koine: see Zerwick, Greek §153, and Bl-D §306.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Hoffmann, Logienquelle 226, and Jülicher, Gleichnisreden 26. To the contrary Schlatter, Lk 495, Schulz, Q 379, and Boismard, Synopse 168. The common form in Mt was corrected by G, lat, syr, sa, to ἐταίροις, while C,W,Θ, the Koine and Ferrar groups added αὐτῶν to ἑτέροις.

<sup>13</sup>Black, Aramaic Approach 304.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Beyer, Syntax 280 (Judeo Palestinian), and Black, op.cit. 304 who gives as examples Erub.5,1; Kil.9,7 and Sheb.2,10. Lagrange, Mt 223, considers λέγουσιν more natural! The changes made by diff. MSS are noteworthy: A,Θ, Koine, vg, syr<sup>p</sup>, sa, bo, harmonized Lk's ὁ λέγει with Mt's (καὶ) λέγουσιν; X, D, L, Ferrar, it, read λέγοντες, which Jülicher, op.cit. 25, preferred as "lectio difficilior" and on account of D. X<sup>c</sup> has λέγοντα, and syr<sup>s</sup> omits it altogether.

<sup>15</sup>Similarly Harnack, Sprüche 17, Hoffmann, op.cit. 197, Schulz, Q 379, Boismard, op.cit. 168. Kilpatrick, Origins 15, holds that Mt tends to avoid κλαίειν.

<sup>16</sup>See also the changes to Mt.11,7.8.9; Mk.5,30; 14,48; as well as Cadbury, Style 163.

of ἄετον and οἶνον (as in 14,1a.15), since he tends to supply the object of the verb.<sup>17</sup> The reference to abstinence from wine recalls John's consecration as a Nazarite (Lk.1,15!), which may account for this addition. (3) The change from the indefinite λέγουσιν to the pointed 2d person, as Lk is so prone to do, thus turning it into a rebuke addressed to the crowds(?).<sup>18</sup> Finally, (4) in v.35 Lk adds πάντων which corresponds to his tendency to generalize by using this adjective.<sup>19</sup> It most probably served to form *inclusio* with πᾶς ὁ λαός in v.29.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, it was probably Mt who omitted the qualificative ὁ βαπτιστής in v.18, and not Lk who added it since he tends to omit it, as a comparison with the parallels to Lk.3,2; 7,16.28 and 9,7 clearly shows.<sup>21</sup> ὁ βαπτιστής probably formed part of the (antithetic) parallelism with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but Mt found it to be superfluous since he had already qualified John as "the Baptist" in v.11.12.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Cadbury, *Style* 151 (where examples are provided), Pernot, *Études* 4ff. These additions may be here in order to stress the type of abstinence of John. What it says is that JnB did not feast nor frequent the well-to-do (cf. art. ἄετος and οἶνος, in *TDNT*). Mt did not need such a precision: cf. 3,4. Grundmann, *Mt* 311, seems to suggest that Mt omitted these precisions in order to strengthen the reference to JnB's fasting. They are omitted by D, it, syr<sup>s</sup>, c.

<sup>18</sup>Syr<sup>c</sup> reads λέγετε in Mt. According to Hoffmann, *Logienquelle* 197, λέγετε is original because v.18f were addressed to the crowds --but, would Jesus have rebuked them, or his adversaries? Rightly, Lagrange, *Lk* 225, Schulz, *Q* 379f, and Boismard, *Synopse* 168. Cadbury, *op.cit.* 124, points out that in a number of Q-passages Lk operates a change to the 2d person pl.; see the examples given by Cadbury in p.124ff. We have already encountered such a change in Lk.5,30c/Mk.2,16/Mt.9,11 (ἐσθίετε, to which Lk also added (!) καὶ πίνετε).

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Cadbury, *op.cit.* 115 and the examples he provides there. <sup>x</sup>c, D, L, Θ, Ψ, Lake group, syr<sup>c</sup>, arm, Irenaeus, Origen and Epiphanius have omitted it. The Ferrar group, itk and some minuscules have added πάντων to Mt's text. For Plummer, *Lk* 209, πάντων is "genuine".

<sup>20</sup>πᾶς ὁ λαός is undoubtedly due to Lk: 1/0/10+6.

<sup>21</sup>In 7,20 there is no parallel in Mt/Mk, and in 9,19 it is exactly as in Mt/Mk. It is never used in Acts when referring to John (7/2/3). Thus, Schulz, *Q* 379, can rightly say that it belonged to Q. According to Klostermann, *Lk* 91, and Hoffmann, *op.cit.* 197, Lk has added it.

<sup>22</sup>The reference to John as ὁ βαπτιστής may well be a further indication of the original independence of v.18f from the parable.

There still remains the problem of the variant ἔργων/τέκνων in v.19d. From the point of view of textual transmission, Lk's τέκνων is very well attested (only the Sinaiticus has ἔργων instead), while in the textual transmission of Mt we read τέκνων instead of ἔργων in many MSS.<sup>23</sup> If these intended to harmonize Mt's text with Lk's,<sup>24</sup> and not the inverse(!), then we have an indication that τέκνων was considered to be more primitive, especially for such early witnesses as the Old Latin and Syriac versions, Irenaeus and Origen. From the literary point of view ἔργων is not rare in Lk (6/2/2+11), nor is τέκνων a favorite (15/9/14+5; metaphorical in Lk.13,34/Mt.23,37 and Lk. 19,44). It is very likely that ἔργων (τῆς σοφίας) was intended by Mt to constitute an inclusio with the beginning of this section on John the Baptist: τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (11,2), which carries on in 11,20 (πλεῖστα δυνάμεις; cf. also 11,21.23). Lk's τέκνων (τῆς σοφίας) may reflect a Semitic genitive.<sup>25</sup> From the point of view of coherence with its overall context, τέκνων is more likely to have been original because it includes John and Jesus but, the ἔργα, though evident with respect to Jesus (as Mt makes manifest in 11,2), are not so with respect to John.<sup>26</sup> It is questionable whether τέκνων and ἔργων are two different translations of (א)בנא, as some exegetes have suggested,<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup>C, D, Koine and Lake groups, it<sup>a</sup>, aur, d, f, h, k, vg, syr<sup>c</sup>, s Diatarab, sa, arm, eth, Irenaeus, Origen, Hilary, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustin --to list the most important ones.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Metzger, Textual Commentary, ad loc.

<sup>25</sup>See Zerwick, Greek §43.

<sup>26</sup>Whether τέκνων refers back to the children mentioned in the parable, as Lührmann, Logienquelle 29, suggests, is questionable because they are called παῖδα, and especially because v.19d originally was unrelated to v.18-19b (cf. infra), not to mention again that v.16f and v.18f originally existed separately. It is possible that the reference to the τέκνων (τῆς σοφίας) attracted this saying into this context; cf. Suggs, Wisdom 35n.9. If σοφία refers to God, it makes sense to speak of his children as witnesses to his justice, not so the works themselves -whose? which? miracles? creation? τέκνων σοφία is Semitizing, as is the expression "child(ren) of ..." as a qualificative.

<sup>27</sup>Resch, Agrapha 227f; Zahn, Lk 316 n.11; Klostermann, Mt 100; Colpe, TDNT VIII, 457 n.390; Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte" 611; Bonnard, Mt 164; Schweizer, Mt 168; Grundmann, Mt 312 n.6, and very emphatically Leivestad, "An Interpretation" 181, all suggest such an original. For Gaechter, Mt 371 n.30, Lk's τέκνων is a variant misreading of mi-ma'alalim for me-'olelim, as C. Jaeger had proposed in RHPR 16(1936), 246f.

because, as we can conclude, Lk and Mt depended on a common (in Greek) written source and this one could have had only one of the two readings. Moreover, it still remains to be shown that  $\tau\lambda\nu = \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$ , and not  $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$  or  $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>28</sup> In view of all these considerations, Lk's  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$  is most probably original.<sup>29</sup>

Origin of the Sophia-clause. There is one more problem which we must tackle: did the reproach-clause  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\omega\nu$  (v.19c)<sup>30</sup> and the  $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ -clause originally belong to v.18f? That they were already present in the source of Mt and Lk is indisputable.

Concerning the reproach-clause, which echoes Mk.2,16 par. and Lk.15,2, it should be noted that  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\eta\varsigma$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$  are placed side by side. It is known that for a Jew a  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\eta\varsigma$  was considered a  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$ . This last adjective, as we have already indicated in Mk.2,16 (q.v.) and Lk.19,7, came to be used at a time when the moral implication of being a tax-collector in a Jewish context was no longer known. It should be observed that this clause, not only has no parallel in the objection raised against John the Baptist, but extends the one raised against Jesus by indicating that  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \omicron\iota\nu\omicron\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta\varsigma$  is a reproach due to his reclining at table with the outcasts. It is easy to understand the probable addition of v.19c because this was a well known accusation against Jesus. The purpose behind such an addition is clear: to point out Jesus' concern for the outcasts, because love was for him above ritual observances (cf. Mt.9,13a) --a consideration ancillary to the original v.18-19b. Therefore, we may assume that v.19c was an addition, i.e. it was not originally part of rejection refrain.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup>Also observed by Lagrange, *Mt* 223; Schmid, *Lk* 146 (Mt corrected Lk); Hoffmann, *Logienquelle* 197; Metzger, *Textual Commentary ad Mt*.11,19. The LXX never transl.  $\tau\lambda\nu$  by  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ !

<sup>29</sup>This is also the opinion of most scholars. To the contrary Gaechter, *Mt* 371, Colpe, *TDNT* VIII, 457 n.390, Leivestad, "An Interpretation" 180f, Jeremias, *Parables* 162 n.44, and Boismard, *Synopse* 168. Resch, *Aussercanonische*, II, 118, has scrutinized the Patristic witnesses: all have  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omega\nu$ !

<sup>30</sup>Mt's order is probably the original one; Lk's corresponds to the intention to create a parallelism with  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \omicron\iota\nu\omicron\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta\varsigma$ .

<sup>31</sup>Similarly Lührmann, *Logienquelle* 29, and Boismard, *Synopse* 167. To the contrary Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte" 601. Schulz, *Q* 384f, indicates that it belongs to the oldest ///

Turning our attention to v.19d, it will be observed that the reference to the σοφία, which is a circumloquium for God as author of the salvifico-historical designs (cf. Sir.24; Wis.6,22-9,18; Prov.8), is foreign to the outlook of v.18-19b. It belongs, as D. Lührmann pointed out,<sup>32</sup> to a series of other logia impregnated with late Jewish wisdom conceptions.<sup>33</sup> V.19d alludes to those who accepted (τῶν τέκνων) John and Jesus, but of this there is reference in v.18-19b. We may therefore presume that the σοφία-clause was originally unrelated to its present context.<sup>34</sup>

What may we conclude about the source(s) of our present texts? First of all, and most evidently, that a common written (on account of the identity in vocabulary) source is at their basis -- known as Q. Second, the vocabulary, especially of v.19c, is what may be termed "typical Lukan": thus ἄμαρτωλός (5/6/17) and especially φίλος (1/0/15).<sup>35</sup> To these may be added προσφωνέω in v.16b (1/0/4+2), δικάιῶ (2/0/5+2) and also σοφία (3/1/6+4) in v.19d. From here one would be tempted to conclude that there is also an influence from the Lkan tradition (pre-Lk?) on Mt.<sup>36</sup> The respective final redactors operated the changes that produced the texts we possess today.

/// strata of Q because it stresses the supremacy of love over cult. Its antiquity is not to be doubted, but the terms φίλος and ἄμαρτωλός suggest a non-Jewish composition.

<sup>32</sup>Logienquelle 97; see also Schweizer, Mt 168.

<sup>33</sup>See Mt.11,25ff/Lk.10,21f; Mt.12,41f/Lk.11,31f; Mt.23,34ff/Lk.11,47f. It is not unlikely that, as Lagrange, Lk 226, and Schmid, Lk 145, pointed out, Lk introduced v.29f in view of v.35, thus forming an *inclusio*. Thus the βουλή τοῦ Θεοῦ (v.30a) would correspond to σοφία (thus Christ, Jesus Sophia 78, Plummer, Lk 208, Feuillet, "Jésus et la Sagesse" 167) and ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεόν (v.29a) to ἐδικαίωθη.

<sup>34</sup>Similarly Lührmann, Logienquelle 29; Suggs, Wisdom 33f; Schweizer, Mt 168; see also Schulz, Q 384f.

<sup>35</sup>Whether v.19c is due to (pre?) Lk is difficult to say in spite of the "Lkan vocabulary". Nevertheless, the difference in syntactical order is to be noted: Mt has τελωνῶν and ἄμαρτωλῶν separated by the change of position of φίλος, while Lk preserves what probably had been a stereotyped couplet. Mt's is a stylistic change.

<sup>36</sup>Boismard's contention, in Synopse 165, 168, that pre-Mt stood between Q and Lk becomes therefore questionable. Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas, passim, had postulated a Qmt and a Qlk; Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte" 605, conceived two different sources which were at the basis of our present Mt and Lk.

## B. Form and Formative Factors.

We have already observed that our pericope is composed of a parable and a subsequent application. The latter was enlarged particularly by the sapiential saying of v.19d. The children's complaint, as well as the criticism levied against John and Jesus, are constructed in antithetical parallelism, an outward indication of their antiquity.

### 1. The Parable.

Verses 16f constitute a severe judgment passed against the  $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  in the clothing of a parable. A similar procedure is to be found in Mt.12,43ff/Lk.11,24ff (the return of the impure spirit), which is at once a judgment and a warning in the eventuality that conversion does not take place on time, and in a lesser manner also in Mt.16,2f/Lk.12,54f (on reading the signs of nature) where, like our parable, it is a question of recognizing Jesus as the Messiah and of deciding for or against him.<sup>37</sup>

The parable reveals a good knowledge of Palestinian customs, and that must have been its primitive "setting in life". Further indications are provided by the general Semitizing tone of the parable and, in particular, the complaint-refrain of the children (see n.4). It is quite possible that it was uttered by Jesus.<sup>38</sup> The complaint-refrain of the parable constitutes its core and it could hardly have been addressed to the crowds (as is often supposed), which approvingly followed Jesus and marvelled at his deeds, but to his opponents who, not only did not approve of Jesus' behavior and rejected him and his message, but who sought to destroy him. This last observation is supported by the other, that  $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  was used as a sort of terminus technicus to refer to the unbelieving Judaism represented by its religious leaders, especially the Pharisees.<sup>39</sup> This

<sup>37</sup>See also Mt.6,22f/Lk.11,34ff. It is noteworthy that these proceed from Q.

<sup>38</sup>In an ostrakon (n.49, found at the Herodium, dated from the 1st cent. A.D.!) published by E. Testa, it becomes apparent that a similar "wisdom concept" was well known in the 1st cent. A.D. Cf. the publication "Un Ostrakon sull'elogio funebre e Mt.11,16ss e paralleli," in RivB 16(1968), 539-546.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Mt.12,39/16,4/Mk.8,12/Lk.11,29; Mt.12,45/Lk.11,26;///



observation opens the question whether ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, which is almost exclusively found in Mt/Lk (Q) texts, is a term due to the early Church and therefore would reflect a Church re-use of this parable in its own controversy with Judaism.<sup>40</sup> That seems to suggest its uses in Acts 2,40; Phil.2,15 and Hebr.3, 10. Lk seems to have understood it this way because he adds τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, thus suggesting that he has to deal with Judaism at large --probably the Jewish community that surrounded Lk's own community,-- and not just with the Jewish leaders.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, there is a direct relation between "this generation" and the application of the parable which, as we saw, was originally independent of the parable. Thus, as will be true of v.18f, the whole pericope was preserved, adapted, and used with a polemic and apologetic (v.19d!) purpose.

## 2. The Application.

We have already seen that v.18f originally existed separately and that v.19c.d were added later. Neither these nor the parable originally had their present context.<sup>42</sup> The whole was introduced here later, either by Q or by pre-Lk, on account of v.18.

V.18-19b, built in antithetic parallelism, has an air of relative antiquity, but its present form is not the primitive one, as the term "Son of Man" and the very Greek φάγος and οἰνοπότης reveal.<sup>43</sup> The accusations that Jesus was "a feast lover" and a friend of sinners is well rooted in his earthly life --hardly due to a creative imagination!-- and was a well known aspect of it, as Mk.2,16.18 par. show. From here it may be de-

/// Mt.12,41.42/Lk.11,31.30; Mt.23,36/Lk.11,50f; see also Lk. 17,25. M. Meinertz, "Dieses Geschlecht im Neuen Testament," BZ NF 1(1957), 283-289, maintains that this expression refers to the whole Jewish people. See also Walker, Heilsgeschichte 35-8.

<sup>40</sup>Schulz, Q 381, responds affirmatively.

<sup>41</sup>In 11,29 Lk has Jesus' objection to the search for a sign addressed to the crowds, while Mt (12,39/Mt.16,4: a doublet) has it addressed to the Scribes and Pharisees, and Mk (8,12) only to the Pharisees.

<sup>42</sup>Similarly Schmid, Mt 191.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. Bultmann, ST 172, and Köster, Synoptische Ueberlieferung 27f, who point out that it is ancient but not in its present form --a conclusion to which I also arrive; evidently this does not mean that it was not formulated first in Aram. (or Hebr.)

duced that the original "setting in life" was Palestinian.

V.18-19b, when it existed without the parable, was polemical against the Jewish leaders (as the parable was!):<sup>44</sup> these were the ones who openly criticized John<sup>45</sup> and Jesus. It is not impossible that at that time it concerned a question of fasting according to Jewish laws and customs: John and Jesus were extremists in this respect.<sup>46</sup> A similar conflict situation may have existed at the time of Q and of the final redactors (a reason for preserving this pericope), as Mt's distant λέγουσιν seems to indicate.<sup>47</sup>

### 3. "The Son of Man" Came.

There is no doubt that ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου refers to Jesus, as is the case in other ἦλθεν-logia. If ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was a colorless term, meaning "a (certain) man", "someone", equivalent to the ἄνθρωπος that follows (v.19b),<sup>48</sup> then we may ask (1) why ὁ υἱὸς κτλ. --note well the definite article ὁ-- is used, and (2) why was not the customary (ἄνθρωπος/ἀνὴρ) τις used instead.<sup>49</sup> It is noteworthy that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου stands in perfect parallelism with Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, and probably was used here with such an intention.<sup>50</sup> It is therefore being used with a very specific purpose.

<sup>44</sup>Tödt, SM 115, sees a resemblance with a controversy story as that in Mk.2,15ff. But, here we do not have a controversy story and v.18f are not defensive or justificatory.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. Mt.3,7ff/Lk.3,7f and Mt.21.25f.32.

<sup>46</sup>Here we have an added indication that v.19c was added later: it deals with the type of company Jesus kept, and not with his "feasting" or not-fasting.

<sup>47</sup>The original most probably read λέγετε, but when tied to the parable was changed to λέγουσιν, which Mt kept and RLk either preserved the original or changed back to λέγετε.

<sup>48</sup>Thus Jeremias, Parables 160 n.37, "Schicht" 165, and NTTh I, 261f; for him the original Aram. was misunderstood -- similarly Schniewind, Mt 146, Gaechter, Mt 370 ("dieser Mensch") and Bonnard, Mt 437, following Colpe, TDNT VIII 431f.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Manson, Teaching 218, and Vielhauer, "Menschensohn" 165 (without a precise subject it gives no "Pointe"). If SM meant as much as "I" then why was not ἦλθον used instead? If SM is a mistranslation of the Aram. שׁוֹן רַן and SM is equivalent to the ἄνθρωπος that follows, then what was the Aram. behind ἄνθρωπος? was it also שׁוֹן רַן? We find the impersonal ἄνθρωπος τις in Mt.18,12; Lk.10,30; 12,16; 14,2.16; 15,11; 16,1.19; 19,12; and ἀνὴρ τις in Lk.8,27.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte" 602, and Hoffmann, Logienquelle 228.

On account of the following considerations, it is unlikely that "Son of Man" here is due to Jesus himself. (1) It serves a literary purpose: the parallelism with "John the Baptist"; (2) it is very probably used in titular fashion to designate Jesus as the eschatological, definitive envoy of God, in contrast to --and therefore superior to!-- John the Baptist; (3) SM intends to stress Jesus' sovereign authority (to bypass fasting observations for the sake of love),<sup>51</sup> within a Messianic context, as we also find in Mk.2,18f par. (4) The use of SM in sayings referring to unbelief and to the rejection of Jesus is rather frequent,<sup>52</sup> and (5) it gives an eschatological and christological dimension to the whole pericope --as it did in Mt.11,6.27.<sup>53</sup>

It can therefore be presumed that "Son of Man" is due to the Greek speaking Palestinian community<sup>54</sup> who used it as a terminus technicus with titular import.<sup>55</sup> It did probably replace a more primitive "I" (ἡλθον),<sup>56</sup> or even ἡλθεν ἄνθρωπος τις, by which Jesus could have referred to himself in an indirect manner, as he does in certain parables.<sup>57</sup> The latter is quite

<sup>51</sup>See esp. Tödt, SM 115f. According to Hoffmann, Logienquelle 149, and Schulz, Q 383, there is no question of Jesus' authority here: true, not explicitly, but it is implicit.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. Mt.9,2-6 par.; 12,1-8 par.; 12,31f par; 12,38-42/16,1f.4/Mk.8,11f/Lk.11,29-32; Mt.16,27 par.; etc.

<sup>53</sup>For Schulz, Q 382, it may imply an expectation of the Parousia as being close at hand; but see Vielhauer, "Menschensohn" 165.

<sup>54</sup>Similarly Tödt, SM 117f. Bultmann, ST 155, followed by Köster, Ueberlieferung 27f, and Schulz, Q 382, consider it to be a purely Hellenistic product.

<sup>55</sup>Perrin, Rediscovering 120 ("a confessional reference to Jesus"); Hoffmann, op.cit. 91; Tödt, SM 115f; Higgins, Jesus 190; Black, Aramaic 329; Vielhauer, art.cit. 165, and Schulz, Q 382f, see it as titular, admitted even by Jeremias, "Schicht" 166f.

<sup>56</sup>Thus Higgins, op.cit. 123; Tödt, SM 116; and Colpe, TDNT VIII,432 n.240; cf. also Bultmann, NTTh I, 30. Ashby, "The Coming" 360, considers it doubtful that SM="I". While for Vielhauer, art.cit. 164f, SM is the original, Fuller, Christology 125, 128, and Jeremias, "Schicht" 166f, consider ἡλθεν as the oldest form. Manson, Teaching 217 and Sayings 70, and Jeremias in NTTh I, 30, consider SM to be a periphrasis for "I" and attribute it to Jesus himself.

<sup>57</sup>See for instance Mt.13,24 (cf. v.37!); 18,12; 20,1; 21,28.33; 25,14 (cf. v.31!), and parallels; where ἄνθρωπος is used in this indirect way. Vielhauer, art.cit. 165, rightly indicates that it remains to be shown that in Q SM replaces an ///

plausible in view of (1) the following ἄνθρωπος (v.19b), (2) the fact that it is conceivable as a free translation of רַבּ שָׁמַיָא,<sup>58</sup> and (3) that it may have suggested its "absolutization" into the titular ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. An original ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος τις/רַבּ שָׁמַיָא would present Jesus as an envoy from God as much as John was, and that may also have been its original sense. Which the original form was remains nevertheless difficult to determine with certitude. The substitution for "Son of Man", however, probably took place when v.16f and v.18f were joined. It follows that "Son of Man" in our pericope implies that he who rejects Jesus as the Christ rejects the Son of Man (who will come as final judge), as is clearly stated in Mk.8,38 par. and Lk.9,26 (cf. also 2 Tim.2,12b). The change from ἦλθεν or ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος τις/רַבּ שָׁמַיָא to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may reflect the Church's consciousness of its own rejection by Judaism following the rejection of Jesus, as Lk.6,22f allows us to perceive: μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν... ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου... (par. Mt.5,11f, which reads instead ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ!); see also Lk.12,10f/Mt.12,32.

Interesting to observe is the relation Son of Man - σοφία in the Pseudepigrapha (4 Es.13; 1 En.37,1ff; 48,1.7; 49,3; 51,3; etc.)<sup>59</sup> and the rejection of the σοφία in Prov.1,24f.29f.32; 8,36 (4 Es.5,9f; 1 En.90,7; 91,6; 93,8; etc.; 1 Bar.48,33.36). It seems therefore probable that, given that "Son of Man" is being used in a Messianic context of rejection, the σοφία - clause is the product of Palestinian wisdom reflections.<sup>60</sup> One may wonder whether the triad ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη-SM-σοφία is not due to the early Church.<sup>61</sup> It should be noted that v.19d has a

/// older first person form, and that therefore SM is not original in the Q logia.

<sup>58</sup>Thus Higgins, Jesus 122, and Manson, Teaching 218.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. Feuillet, "Jésus et la Sagesse" 168; Suggs, Wisdom 48f, and Christ, Jesus Sophia passim.

<sup>60</sup>See further 11QPs.18,8.15.18, and Grundmann, Mt 312, as well as Christ, op.cit. passim.

<sup>61</sup>Lührmann, Logienquelle 43, considers the opposition between Jesus and this γενεὰ to be a redactional motif that served to bring out the element of decision. It is to be noted that the opposition between the SM and the present generation recurs in Mt.12,40f/Lk.11,30, and here also, in connection with σοφία! The schema of rejection by this γενεὰ, followed by a consequent judgment by the SM, is also found in Mk.8,38 and Lk.17,24ff.



3. Distinctiveness. Could this saying have been created by the early Church? It has frequently been pointed out that the early Church lowered the figure of John the Baptist as a result of conflicts with the Baptist's sect.<sup>67</sup> Undoubtedly the accusation that Jesus is a φάγος καὶ οἶνοπότης was shared by the Baptist's disciples (cf. Mk.2,18 par.), but here it can hardly come from a conflict between Christians and the Baptist's sect since it is preceded by an accusation leveled against the Baptist himself, which can hardly be attributed to the same group.<sup>68</sup> Not only the picture of John is not lowered but the authenticity of his prophetic mission is being implicitly defended.<sup>69</sup> The accusation against John is in view of that against Jesus. If the community had invented this logion, would it not have used the judgment δαιμόνιον ἔχει, or similar, also for Jesus (cf. Mt.10,25; 9,32-34/12,22-30 par.)? It is difficult to think that the early Church, which held Christ as its κύριος, would have downgraded Jesus with such an accusation as that of v.19b. The primitiveness of v.18-19b is suggested, not by its "setting in life" but by the antithetical similarity between John and Jesus.<sup>70</sup>

The accusation ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἶνοπότης, or similar, contrasting with JnB's style of life, could have been uttered by Jesus --echoing back his adversaries (Mk.2,16.18; Lk.15,2; 19,7)-- in a situation of conflict against the legalistic mea-

<sup>67</sup>See Perrin, Rediscovering 120; Higgins, Jesus 122; Lührmann, Logienquelle 42, 85; Vielhauer, "Menschensohn" 164. By way of contrast, it can be observed that while here JnB is also accused, in Mk.2,18 the Baptist's disciples share in the accusation against Jesus, that he does not fast. In the parallels, viz. Mt.9,14/Lk.5,33, the accusation comes only from the Baptist's disciples! Thus, we have an added indication that M.11, 18f is a very ancient piece of tradition.

<sup>68</sup>Köster, Ueberlieferung 28, sees here an accusation by the Baptist's sect, equal to Mk.2,18 par. Schweizer, "Menschensohn" 200, and Teeple, "The Origin" 235, are of the opinion that its origin is in the rivalry between the early Church and the Baptist's sect. However, it must be observed that the general esteem that people had for JnB, which is mentioned in Mt.21,25f par.; 21,32, and Josephus, Ant.XVIII, 116-119, are in a similar vein as Mt.11,18. See further W. Wink, John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition, Cambridge 1968, passim, esp. 18-23.

<sup>69</sup>V.19d also presupposes an equal footing between JnB and Jesus: both are equally τέκνα τῆς σοφίας.

<sup>70</sup>The form ἦλθεν (χὰε) Ἰωάννης is found again in Mt.21,32 which is on Jesus' lips as well.

suring standards of the Pharisees: opposite life styles are equally rejected. Such a logion can hardly be explained as having originated in conflicts of the early Church with Judaism, even if it could have been employed on such occasions. It is not at all unthinkable --and it seems more likely-- that its essence was uttered by Jesus in polemic circumstances, given the fact that he did indulge in banquets (cf. Mk.2,15 par.; 14,3 par.; Lk.11,37; 14,1).

We may, therefore, conclude that the present form of this logion, which reflects a Hellenistic mode of speech, does not go back to Jesus, but the essence of it, viz. the analogy with John the Baptist, the grounds of objection, and a corresponding "rejective accusation", has very high chances of having had its origin in an utterance of Jesus, i.e. that it is ipsissima vox Iesu.<sup>71</sup>

#### D. From the Origin to the Final Redaction of Mt.11,16-19 par.

Two important moments in the transmission and formation of our pericope have been discerned: a separate transmission of the parable and of the saying of v.18-19b, and the coupling of these plus the addition of v.19c.d.

##### 1. Primitive Message of the Parable.

The parable itself, i.e. independent of v.18f, pointed to the fact that the Jews were missing the kairos, i.e. the chance of actual salvation that was coming to them in the person of Jesus. They expected him to dance or lament whenever they chose: the Messiah --and God's will-- was to conform to their laws and pre-established expectations. They did not read the signs of the messianic time (of decision) but rather concentrated on "the rules of the game". Consequently, since Jesus

---

<sup>71</sup>Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte" 605, 611, Manson, Teaching 217, Higgins, Jesus 190, Colpe, TDNT VIII, 431, followed by Bonnard, Mt 437, G. Rochais, in Jésus?, Montreal 1974, 88f, and vaguely Schweizer, Mt 168, consider it to be an authentic logion of Jesus. To the contrary, Tödt, SM 125, Hahn, Hoheitstitel 44, Hoffmann, Logienquelle 228, Schulz, Q 382, as well as Bultmann, ST 155, consider it to be a Church product. Conzelmann, NTTh 134, is reluctant to pronounce himself and contents himself with simply stating that "This saying, too, is not 'uninventable'."

did not conform to their "whimsical" expectations he was rejected and with him the opportunity for conversion was not only being bypassed but flatly rejected.<sup>72</sup>

## 2. The Allegorizing Process.

When v.18f was joined with the parable, the latter was allegorized. It is John and his followers who did not dance, and Jesus and his own who did not mourn when expected. In view of the established opposition, the *παιδία* are qualified as *ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη*. The messianic and eschatological outlook of the pericope was further brought out by the context in which it was placed. The allusion in v.19c to Jesus' table-fellowship with the outcasts, a clear sign of the messianic joy (cf. Mk.2,18f/Lk.5,33f!),<sup>73</sup> and the allusion of v.19d to God's wisdom which is justified by its envoys and those who welcome them, enhance the messianic and eschatological outlook of our pericope.

## 3. The Final Redactors.

As we reach the third step in the formation of our pericope, RMT operated two important changes, viz. from *ἀλλήλοις* to *τοῖς ἑτέροις* in v.16, and from *τέκνων* to *ἐρχων* in v.19d. Mt's *τοῖς ἑτέροις* indicates that, in the light of v.18f, he understood the parable allegorically, opposing two groups:<sup>74</sup> the *παιδία* / *ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη* and John and Jesus/SM, and their disciples. The former complain about (reprimand!) the latter for not entering into the game they expected them to play.

---

<sup>72</sup>Since we need not to detain ourselves in a full exposé about the sense of the parable, we refer the reader to the bibliography given in n.1. However, I would like to point out that the complaint-refrain comes from the children, i.e. from those to whom Jesus referred (and probably addressed) the parable. These are the ones who piped -nuptial joy- and wailed: note the 1st persons plural in their mouths (*ἠυλόσαμεν, ἐθρονήσαμεν*). It should also be noted that since Jesus speaks the parable, he cannot be part of *ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη*, and consequently it is not he who sings the complaint-refrain. It is Jesus and his followers who did not dance and did not mourn. The *tertius comparationis* is the children's attitude and expectations. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden* II, 31, and after him a good number of exegetes, consider John and Jesus to be the ones who piped and wailed, but see the remarks of Schweizer, *Mt* 171.

<sup>73</sup>Cf. Mussner, "Der nicht erkannte" 602f; Tödt, *SM* 115; Perrin, *Rediscovering* 105f, and Walker, *Heilsgeschichte* 120-127.

<sup>74</sup>See Lagrange, *Lk* 223; Mussner, *art.cit.* 599f; Hoffmann, *Logienquelle* 226. To the contrary Plummer, *Lk* 206, sees this opposition in Lk's *ἀλλήλοις*.



RMt's substitution of τέκνων for ἔρχων specifies his understanding of ἐδικαιώθη. For Mt it is the deeds that are the measure of true δικαιοσύνη; in fact, they are the manifestations of it (cf. 5,16.20; 6,1; 12,33-37; 23,28)<sup>75</sup> as seen in the lives of Jesus (cf. 3,15) and of the Baptist (cf. 21,32). The ἔργα here mentioned are not just Jesus' wonders, signs of the irruption of the messianic times, but also his striking behavior (cf. 11,4b: ἀκούετε, and 11,6), cause of reproach and rejection. However, here Mt is more interested in Jesus' powerful deeds --as the context well indicates: 11,2.5.20-24,-- probably with an apologetic purpose, in that these proved God's salvific plan personified in Jesus, to be correct (ἐδικαιώθη).<sup>76</sup> As F. Christ rightly pointed out, setting ἔργα with σοφία not only precises ἐδικαιώθη more than in Lk, but also historicizes it.<sup>77</sup> The divine wisdom finds rejection by the γένεα αὕτη in the rejection of Jesus (cf. Lk.10,22/Mt.11,27) because its emissaries acted in a manner unacceptable to the ways of this world, bypassing their calculations and expectations (cf. Lk. 10,21/Mt.11,25). That is why Jesus refuses to grant a sign to the γένεα αὕτη in Mt.12,39 par. (cf. also Mk.9,19 par.)

Luke understands the τέκνα as including all those who believed in Jesus, i.e. the non-γένεα αὕτη, as his addition of

<sup>75</sup>See our analysis of Mt.5,17f, and also Strecker, *Weg*, esp. 149-158 and 175ff, Trilling, *Wahre Israel* 183ff, and Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung* I, *passim*.

<sup>76</sup>Εδικαιώθη may be a timeless, gnomic aorist; thus Plummer, *Lk* 108, Turner, *NTGk* III, 73, and Jeremias, *Parables* 162 n.42. However, as Moule, *Idiom-Book* 13, adds, it can also be a statement of a past fact: "it was proved right." The preposition ἀπό has the sense of ὑπό, i.e. causal; cf. Bl-D §210(2), Moule, *op.cit.* 73, Zerwick, *Greek* §63, 90, Moulton, *NTGk* II, 461, and Turner, *NTGk* III, 258.

Christ, *Jesus Sophia* 66-69, 77, 79, and *passim*, after analyzing a number of texts from the OT and Pseudepigrapha, concluded that on the basis of these and certain thematic similarities, Jesus himself is, in our text, the *sophia*. However, that seems to me unlikely: the *sophia* is the one that sent both, JnB and Jesus (cf. Lk.11,49!) --both give reason to the *sophia*, and the logia are found in Jesus' mouth! It would be more precise to say that Jesus is the bearer of the divine wisdom (cf. Lk.2, 40.52; Mt.12,42/Lk.11,31). Leivestad, "An Interpretation" 180, followed by Gaechter, *Mt* 371, thinks that it refers ironically to the wisdom of the Jews --for which I can see no basis.

<sup>77</sup>*Jesus Sophia* 76. This is also one of the important conclusions about the whole tendency of the Mtan gospel, to which Strecker arrived in his dissertation, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*.

πάντων reveals.<sup>78</sup> The theme of rejection is clearer in Lk's version by the opposition ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη - SM (+ τέκνα). Concerning the implications in Lk's change of ἦλθεν to the perf. tense see below.

E. The Meaning of Ἔρχεσθαι in Mt. 11, 18f/Lk. 7, 33f.

1. We have already indicated that the expression ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is due to the early Palestinian community, and most probably replaces an earlier ἦλθον/ἦλθεν or an ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος τις / וְיָנִי בְּיָמָיו. In its earliest form, i.e. without the parable and v. 19c.d, it described in programmatic fashion (parallel to JnB's), Jesus' peculiar behavior which, not characterized by the observance of the fasting laws as known and demanded of Jews, drew the scorn and objection here enunciated. In view of the parallelism with the Baptist's coming, the pre-SM form indicated a prophet's mission, especially in so far as he also dashed against the traditions and prescriptions as the prophets of old did. The prophetic roles of both are rejected and both were doomed to "martyrdom" just as was the case with other prophets.<sup>79</sup> The logion tells us the manner by which they lived their prophetic roles by pointing to what is most characteristic of both and at once most irritating to those who reject them. This logion, in its earliest form, certainly need not look back at the totality of Jesus' mission on earth from the point of view of the early community. The reference to the Baptist, while not a fortiori looking back at the totality of his career, most probably did so. However, the fact that the same verbal tense (aor.) was used for both in what are two parallel phrases, does not necessarily imply the same outlook on the one uttering it. If behind the present "Son of Man" stood ἦλθον/ἦλθεν, then it had a strong authoritative tone, analogous to the ἐγώ εἰμι of the Fourth Gospel, implying "I came among you as God's emissary."

2. The change to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου gave a definite eschatological and messianic orientation to v. 19. Jesus' coming

<sup>78</sup>For Hoffmann, Logienquelle 118, the τέκνα are the Q - community.

<sup>79</sup>Cf. Mt. 5, 12; 23, 30-34, 37, and par. in Lk (Q!), and Mk. 6, 4 and par.

is seen as the coming of the Son of Man inasmuch as it inaugurated the eschatological times and with it the divine irreversible judgment (cf. Mt.11,20-24/Lk.10,12-15).<sup>80</sup> This is all the more evident when placed in a salvific-historical relation to the Baptist, as Mt.11,12f/Lk.7,16 points out. The SM came in the person of Jesus, and with him the Kingdom has been inaugurated. Hence, it can be said that ἦλθεν-SM has an epiphanic character. It looks back at Jesus' unique manner of approaching men in order to offer them membership in the Kingdom.<sup>81</sup>

3. Luke's ἐλήλυθεν (perf.) is without any doubt looking back at the totality of John's and Jesus' earthly career from the point of view of the community.<sup>82</sup> The perfect tense points to the fact that their coming has not been valueless for it continues to be manifest in their τέκνα.

4. When the σοφία-clause was added, v.18f acquired an added meaning: John and Jesus are the emissaries of the σοφία. The latter is the sender of the former, as he was of the prophets (Lk.11,49), and through them, especially Jesus, the σοφία revealed itself definitively. Thus, ἦλθεν approaches the sense of ἀπεστάλη.<sup>83</sup> However, the sense of ἀπεστάλη is hardly detectable in Mt's version in which τέκνων is substituted by ἔργων; Lk's addition of πάντων weakens it since he also sees the followers of Jesus under τέκνων.

5. When our pericope was placed in its present context, ἦλθεν came to correspond to John's question whether Jesus is the ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Mt.11,3/Lk.7,19), whom Habakkuk (2,3) and Malachi (3,1) had foretold would come. It is not impossible that the ὁ ἐρχόμενος of Mt.11,3 par. became (in what now is part of Jesus' public testimony about John spurred by the latter's query) ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου under the influence especially of

<sup>80</sup>Interesting is the apocalyptic statement of 1 En.62,14: "And with that Son of Man shall they eat, ...."

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Bultmann, ST 155, Tödt, SM 115 +n.1, and Schulz, Q 382. For Colpe, TDNT VIII,431 n.238, ἦλθεν does not look back at Jesus' earthly existence as a whole, mainly because we have the 3d, and not the 1st person (?); but see Vielhauer, "Menschensohn" 164.

<sup>82</sup>This is also acknowledged by Colpe, art.cit. 457 n.390.

<sup>83</sup>Cf. Hoffmann, Logienquelle 180, 229f, Suggs, Wisdom 44, and Schulz, Q 386. It is interesting to observe that Origen ///

Dan.7,13 where it is said: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο.<sup>84</sup> Within the general context of our pericope, ἦλθεν has the sense of "coming as a messenger sent by God" in the case of the Baptist (cf. Mt.11,10/Lk.7,27) and of "coming from God" in an epiphanic sense in the case of Jesus-SM. Jesus is the one for whom the Baptist had prepared the way and the one who came as the unrecognized, yet majestic and authoritative Son of Man.

Taking the grammatical construction of the phrase ἦλθεν (ἐσθίων κτλ. into consideration, it is not ἐρχεσθαι but ἐσθίων κτλ. that is the focus of attention, as the reproach it occasioned clearly indicates. The indicative provides the time of the beginning of the action which in the aorist takes it globally, while the present participle indicates the aspect of the action, the manner in which it is carried out, i.e. ἦλθεν introduces the action that is next described.<sup>85</sup> It is a Semitism of the type ...וְהָיָה, where הָיָה serves the function of introducing the action next mentioned. This usage, with the verb "to come/go" is typical (and frequent in the OT!) of that used to describe the activity of a messenger (eg. Jn.1,31b).

Thus, we may conclude that what the ἦλθεν-clauses portray is the particular manner in which John and Jesus, as envoys of God, approached those to whom they came. It is not "that" but "how" they presented themselves which constitutes the main idea behind these clauses, an idea supported by the ἦλθεν + part. form. That there is no question of pre-existence<sup>86</sup> nor of messianic consciousness is evident.

### Conclusion.

The pericope we have just studied was found to have been composed by the union of two previously separately existing components: a parable touching on the fact that many a Jew was unable to recognize the beginning of the new kairos, and a logion about the lack of acceptability John and Jesus had found

/// stated, in Jer.Hom. xiv,5: ἀποστέλλει ἡ σοφία τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς.

<sup>84</sup>The version of Theodotion reads: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν, a literal transl. of the MT: הָיָה כְּבָר אֱנוֹשׁ בְּנֵי אָדָם.

<sup>85</sup>Cf. Zerwick, Greek §371.

<sup>86</sup>Against Hamerton-Kelly, Pre-Existence 42f, who sees Jesus' pre-existence in this logion.

on the part of the Jewish leaders on account of their behavior. The two were found together in Q. As a result of their union the parable became allegorically reinterpreted through v.18-19b. The parable has been found to have been better preserved in Lk; not so the "application". While the saying of v.19c may have come from L, the wisdom-saying was already in Q but primitively had been unrelated to v.18-19b.c.

The statement of v.19a was not originally in terms of "the Son of Man" but either ἦλθον or, more probably ἦλθεν (ἀνθρώπος) ρις. This was easily changed at an early stage into a SM-saying, so that Jesus' superiority over the Baptist, as the final eschatological envoy, possessor of supreme authority, could be brought out.

After closely studying the saying of v.18-19b in its presumably earliest form, we saw that this uncomplementary statement could hardly have originated anywhere but in Jesus' surroundings and very probably in Jesus himself, although not in its present Hellenistic wording. Here we are hearing Jesus' ipsissima vox (not verba). The verb ἔρχεσθαι had no particular significance except to bring out, with the description of JnB's and Jesus' personal approach to men, their role as messengers of God. As a SM-statement, ἔρχεσθαι acquired an eschatological and messianic tone. However, it is always the manner of their appearance, and not the fact that they "came" that is in the forefront.

Here we see how, in a most ancient logion, the verb ἔρχεσθαι had no greater significance than that which it has when used to speak about a messenger "coming" to his addressee. Here, as in previous pericopes, the introduction of the titular "Son of Man" gives an added dimension to the whole saying, and very particularly to the verb ἔρχεσθαι, inasmuch as it brings to mind the realization of Dan.7 and 1 En.: that "Son of Man" came in the person of Jesus; it is Jesus!

- - - - -

#### IV. THE COMING OF ELIJAH: Mk.9,11-13/Mt.17,10-12.13

It is well known that Judaism expected the return of the prophet Elijah at the end-times on the basis of the account of his ascension, in 2 Kgs.2,11f, and of the prophecy of Mal.3,22f

"Look, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes ...." This expectation, which was vivid in the intertestamentary period,<sup>1</sup> also found its way into the NT. People were wondering whether or not John the Baptist is Elijah (Jn.1,21.25). Herod heard that some were saying that, on account of his works, Jesus is Elijah who has reappeared (Mk.6,15 par.). When Jesus asked his disciples who people say he is, the answer included the opinion of some that he is Elijah (Mk.8,28 par.).

The question of Elijah's coming/return is bluntly treated in Mk.9,11-13/Mt.17,10-13. This short pericope, which we shall briefly analyze, originally had --as most exegetes today recognize,-- an existence separate from the Transfiguration, and probably followed Mk.9,1 par. It was omitted by Luke because he never identifies the Baptist with Elijah and he tends to minimize the figure of JnB. For Lk there exists a clear demarcating line between JnB and Jesus (cf. 16,16!): up to John inclusive reigns the old order; the new order begins with Jesus' baptism. That is why JnB is no longer mentioned in 3,21f as in Mt/Mk and the Baptist's end is anticipated in 3,19ff --not after 9,9, as would fit according to Mk's sequence. For Lk Jesus is "the new Elijah": he performs the same miracles (7,11-16) and is raised to heaven (24,51; Acts 1,2.9.22; cf. 2 Kgs.2,11).<sup>2</sup>

#### A. Literary Analysis.

In the overall structuring of this pericope, Mt has changed the position of the reference to the SM's sufferings so as to clarify the text which in Mk is obscure. Mt has, furthermore, omitted the γέγραπται-references on account of their obscurity and introduced two clarifications. In v.12a Mt added οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν ἀλλά,<sup>3</sup> and in v.13 the conclusion that the disciples realized that Jesus was talking about John the Baptist -- which echoes back to 11,14: εἰ θέλετε δεῖξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας

<sup>1</sup>See G. Molin, "Der Prophet Elijah und sein Weiterleben in den Hoffnungen des Judentums und der Christenheit," *Jud* 4 (1952), 65-94; J. Jeremias, art. Ἠ(ε)λίας, in *TDNT* II, 931-934, 936, and esp. the excursus in Billerbeck IV/2, 764-798.

<sup>2</sup>See Boismard, *Synopse* 68, and W. Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, Cambridge 1968, 42-45.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Klostermann, *Mt* 143, and Allen, *Mt* 187.

ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι.

The question is posed in exactly the same way in Mk and Mt, the latter having given it a better syntactical order. The response-allusion to Mal.3,22 either has been harmonized with the LXX by Mt or Mt has preserved pre-Mk inasmuch as he uses the future ἀποκαταστήσει, and not the present tense (as Mk). Mt also has the present ἔρχεται (Mal. ἀποστέλλω) and not the aorist as Mk. Mt omitted πρῶτον since it was already mentioned that Ἡλίας δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον. In Mk the actual explanation about Elijah's coming takes the perspective of his account of the Baptist's fate in 6,14-29: ἐλήλυθεν (perf.) - ἤθελον (impf.) while in Mt it takes a purely historical perspective: he uses the aorist. In the use of the aor. ἠθέλησαν and the unusual ἐν αὐτῷ Mt may be retaining his source's formulation, while ἦδη ἦλθεν is most probably his own formulation.<sup>4</sup>

The reference to Jesus' Passion has been changed by Mt: it no longer refers back to Scripture, as it does in Mk, but now refers it to its prefiguration which is the Baptist's fate. This re-orientation of the material cause of Jesus' own fate, as presented by Mt, can be observed in the adv. οὕτως and the parallelism between ὑπ' αὐτῶν and οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν ... ἐποίησαν ... ἠθέλησαν.

The oldest form, with the exception of the reference to Mal.3,22, seems therefore to have been preserved in Mk. At an earlier stage it most probably did not speak of Jesus' Passion (cf. *infra*).

#### B. Form and Formative Factors.

The form of the pericope under study is that of a questio disputata, and objection-response. The original pericope most probably did not refer to Jesus' forthcoming end.<sup>5</sup> Mt had to

<sup>4</sup>Mt uses ἦδη + a verb in 5,28; 14,15.25; 15,32 (not so in Mk). The perf. ἐλήλυθεν of Mk has been changed to Mt's ἦδη ἦλθεν (aor.) by C,W (in inverted order) and the Lake group.

<sup>5</sup>Similarly Robinson, Mt 146, who sees its origin in a different source; Allen, Mt 187, and Hahn, *Hoheitstitel* 377, who consider it a Mtan addition; Bultmann, *ST* 125, for whom it is an interpolation, and Lohmeyer, *Mk* 183 n.1, who considers it to be a gloss. See further the discussion by Tödt, *SM* 194-198, who considers it to have been part of the text from the very beginning.

re-place it so as to clarify the sense of the whole pericope. The reference to Jesus' Passion is illogically used in Mk: one passes from Elijah's coming to the SM's suffering; it breaks the natural flow of the topic under discussion, between the question and the response. The repetition ἐλθὼν (πρῶτον) in v.12a and ἐλήλυθεν in v.13a, is a kind of Wiederaufnahme necessary on account of the insertion of the SM's fate. The complement to v.12b is to be found in v.9b --which refers to the Resurrection. The introduction of this ancillary topic is understandable inasmuch as the futility of the objection raised --which is drawn from Scripture,-- is answered with a reference to Scripture --but to our knowledge nowhere explicitly foretold-- viz. the suffering of the SM: it plays Scripture against Scripture, Mal.3,22f against an allusion to Ps.21,7 and Isa. 52,14; 53,2a.3,<sup>6</sup> transposed to the figure of the SM. The parallelism between Elijah and the SM is intended in view of their analogous fate, i.e. that of the former (in the person of JnB) prefigures that of the latter, as Mt made it plain: οὕτως καὶ κτλ. A parallelism between the rejection of the Baptist and of Jesus was found in Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f. In Mk Elijah's fate is said to have taken place καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν. This is again a play on Scripture and prefigurations: Elijah's sufferings, related in 1 Kgs.19,2.10.14, prefigures --as his prophetic career<sup>7</sup>-- those of JnB, as the latter's prefigures those of Jesus.

The earliest "setting in life" of our pericope is hardly to be found in Jesus' lifetime. It serves an apologetic purpose, to counteract a Jewish objection<sup>8</sup> which was still alive

<sup>6</sup>Ps.21,7: "I am a worm and not man [cf. Isa.52,14; 53,2b. 3!], reproached by men and ἐξουδένημα by the people."

<sup>7</sup>The parallelism between Elijah and JnB can be suspected in the following details: Jezebel plays the role Herodias will play --two wives unacceptable to the religious folk,-- the husband-kings playing at their hands. Elijah openly rebukes the king's behavior (1 Kgs.21,18ff) as JnB will also do. Elijah anoints his successor (1 Kgs.19,16), as JnB baptized Jesus. In our text JnB is pictured as a disguised Elijah, as Jesus is the Son of Man in disguise.

<sup>8</sup>Similarly Lohmeyer, Mk 183; Bultmann, ST 124; Tödt, SM 196ff. The objection to Jesus' messiahship comes from the Scribes, i.e. the scholars of Judaism. Note also the emphatic δεῖ in the question and the likewise emphatic ἀλλά/δέ in the actual response.



in the time of Justin Martyr (cf. Dial. 49,3-5!). The question of Elijah's coming could only have arisen once Jesus was acknowledged and proclaimed to have been God's definitive (messianic!) envoy. If Jesus is the final revelation of God, why had not Elijah, who should according to Mal.3,22f precede it, come yet? The answer to the objection leads into the messiahship of Jesus: if Elijah had already come, then so did "the day of the Lord", the day when he would ἐπιφανῇ (Mal.3,22b); Elijah did come but was not recognized.

### C. The Significance of ἔρχεσθαι.

The coming of Elijah, an apocalyptic topos, as well as the reference to Jesus as Son of Man, introduces us into the apocalyptic representation-world of the end-times. Yet, the outlook is historical: Elijah already came and so did the Son of Man; hence, Elijah must have come in the person of John the Baptist as the Son of Man did in that of Jesus.<sup>9</sup>

The change from ἀποστέλλω to ἔρχεται is noteworthy. Speaking as the mouth of Yahweh, Malachi had announced in 3,22:

---

<sup>9</sup>The identification of Elijah with JnB is formally stated by Mt in v.13. Mk did not need to do so because he refers the reader to his account of the Baptist's fate (6,14-29) when he writes "καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν," meaning the prefiguration of 1 Kgs.19,2.10.14 and probably also the tradition from which he received this account. For a number of scholars καθὼς γέγραπται refers not to the OT but to apocryphal writings -which?- thus Klostermann, Mk 89; Lohmeyer, Mk 183f; Taylor, Mk 395; Hahn, Hoheitstitel 377; Jeremias, TDNT II, 939ff.

From the Qumran documents, some have interpreted the "Interpreter (or Seeker) of the Law" as Elijah, on account of the former's identification with the Aaronic (priestly) messiah, on the basis that it was expected that Elijah would settle the Rabbinic disputes about the Law (cf. Ed.7,7; Menach.45a; A.Z. 36a; Git.6b; etc.) and would be the eschatological High Priest (cf. T.Reub.6; T.Sim.7; etc.). Thus A.S. van der Woude and E. Cothenet. For others it is the "Teacher of Righteousness" who is Elijah, thus G. Vermes, A. Dupont-Sommer, W.H. Brownlee, K. Schubert. Whether these two appellations correspond to the same individual remains an open question. See the latest evaluation of the research so far done, in W.S. LaSor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, Grand Rapids 1972, 120ff.

Finally, a note on terminology. Scholars often speak of Elijah redivivus. It seems to me that that term should be buried: there was no expectation that Elijah would come to life again, as if he had died --it applies well to Herod's suspicion in Mk.6,15 par. The expectation was of his re-appearance, since he had "ascended into heaven", not of his "resurrection"!

"I will send (ἀποστέλλω) you the prophet Elijah before ...." Our pericope echoes this announcement in terms of coming: "Elijah indeed is to come (ἔρχεται/έλθών) ...." While ἀποστέλλω takes the point of view of God, ἔρχεται takes that of the envoy. And, while ἀποστέλλω places the initiative (promise) on God, ἔρχεται takes that for granted and concentrates on the REAL-ization of the awaited fulfilment.

The use of ἔρχεσθαι in connection with Elijah, now an apocalyptic figure, has the same force and significance ἔρχεσθαι has when used with respect to the final coming of the SM, viz. that of an epiphanic appearance/presence. Furthermore, placed in parallel with Jesus (v.12b), it indicates that ἔρχεσθαι has the same significance with respect to Jesus' coming, i.e. that which constitutes the background of ἦλθεν in the logia we are studying, viz. in Jesus' coming we encounter the epiphanic appearance of God, whose mouth and hands he is. It is also to be observed that Elijah's coming was not a mere re-appearance but had a specific purpose: ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα --a purpose that was frustrated by those who "did to him what they wished."

## PARTIAL CONCLUSION

Having concluded our analysis of passages where the ἡλθον and related sayings are found, and before we turn our attention to complementary questions, it is convenient to gather the results of our study of these logia.

1. In every one of the pericopes analyzed in c.I and II, when the earliest (reachable) form was sought it resulted that at that stage the ἡλθον-saying had been absent. All the logia we have studied originally had a separate existence before being incorporated into the account or the discourse now containing it.

2. Whenever the ἡλθον-saying is found within a story (Mk.2,15-17 par; Lk.9,51-56; 19,1-10; also Mk.1,35-38 par), the pericope has a paradigmatic character which is directed at the community. The logion is, furthermore, found (at the end!) as the element that illuminates the Christological explicative light on the story. In fact, the ἡλθον-sayings were found to have been included as the explicative key --thus the γὰρ in Mk.10,45; Lk.9,56a; 19,10.

3. The ἡλθον-sayings are programmatic statements of Jesus' soteriologically intended career or of the consequences thereof (Mt.10,34). Not all these were found to have originated in the "prophetic mouth" of the early Church. Thus Lk.12,49 has high chances of being ipsissima verba Iesu and, while Mk.2,17b and Mt.10,34b could have been pronounced by Jesus their formulations are most probably due to the Church. None of the "inauthentic" logia were found to be a final redactor's creation; rather they proceed from an older tradition.

4. The οὐκ...ἀλλά form of some of the ἡλθον-sayings was found to be in all cases a dialectic formulation ("not so much...as...") meaning that not only the affirmative clause is underlined by means of the negative one, but that the latter was not intended as an absolute negation.

5. The Son of Man logia were found to have originally been "I" (ἡλθον) sayings. This became most evident in Mk.10,45. None of the SM-logia was found to go back to Jesus --in any form.

6. The change from ἦλθον to ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is understandable inasmuch as these logia look back at the totality of Jesus' earthly career and intend to bring out his supreme authority, his God-given mission, and possibly reflect on Jesus' pre-existence. They have an eschatological orientation. SM was used in logia that already had a specific OT passage as background (Mk.10,45: Isa.53; Lk.19,10: Ezek.34,15f; Lk.9,56a: 2 Kgs.1,10.12).

7. The significance of ἔρχεσθαι, which to a great extent is determined by the inf. of purpose that follows, is not identical in all the ἦλθον-logia. It differs not only between logia but also in the different discernible levels of tradition: from its separate existence up to its final form within the present context.

a. Before being integrated in their present contexts, it is the infinitive of purpose that generally bears the weight and stress. As was also found to be true for the logia that were used to constitute a discourse, at that early stage when the logia had a separate existence, ἦλθον + inf. had the sense of "my purpose is to ...," i.e. ἦλθον itself had no particular significance.

b. Determined by the context in which they are integrated, which constitutes a sort of illustrative preamble, the ἦλθον-logia acquired an added significance (note the triple ἦλθον in Mt.10,34.35a!). They became statements of one having a God-given authority; the task indicated by the inf. is a God-given mission. This is clearer in the uses of Son of Man. Ἐλθὼν acquires therefore a significance of its own in that it approaches ἀπεστάλην and thereby becomes the verbal expression of Jesus' coming by the design of God. This is observable in Lk's change to παρεγενόμην in 12,51, and to the perfect ἐλήλυθα in 5,32 and 7,34 (cf. also 4,43). What originally had been a purpose saying became a mission saying.

c. All the ἦλθον-sayings, in the stage of tradition which fixed them in their present contexts and thereby determined them --with the exception of Lk.12,49-- respond to a catechetical --and often also parenetical-- interest of the early Church, and as such look back at the totality of Jesus' earthly career (see Lk's change to the perf. ἐλήλυθα in 5,32; 7,33f).

Less frequently is there a hint at Jesus' pre-existence, and therefore to God's preordained plan of salvation.

8. A tendency to multiply ἦλθον-sayings is observable in Mt.18,11, in the change from a more primitive (ἐγὼ) εἰμί-saying (Lk.22,27) to an ἦλθον-saying in Mk.10,45, and in the triple ἦλθον of Mt.10,34.35a. Likewise, a tendency on the part of Lk to explicitly orient ἔρχεσθαι Christologically was observable in the changes to the perf. tense in 5,32 and 7,34, and ἐξηλθον to ἀπεστάλην in 4,43.

9. While ἦλθον incarnates Jesus' historical presence among men, its substitution by "the Son of Man came" looks more at the divine envoy, the eschatological personage who came from God for the salvation of men (Mk.10,45; Lk.19,10) and will come again as judge. By the introduction of the figure of the SM, ἦλθεν gains an added dimension: it reflects on Jesus' divine origin (Dan.7; 1 En.), marks the event of his authoritative coming as a once-and-for-all event, and projects the continuous value of this event and the reason for it into the future.

The study of the closely related logia in c.III has provided further support to some traits we thought to discover in our study of the ἦλθον-logia.

1. An (ἐξ)ἔρχεσθαι-saying constitutes the climax of the story of Jesus' departure from Capharnaum (Mk.1,38), and the core of the accounts of the exorcisms at Capharnaum (Mk.1,24 par) and Gerasa (Mt.8,29). In both the saying did not have a separate existence and it was soon given a Christological orientation.

2. In Mt.11,18f par., which is ipsissima vox Iesu, we found an added case where "Son of Man" replaced an older ἦλθον-saying. There likewise we observe the tendency to extend ἦλθον to the whole of Jesus' (and the Baptist's) earthly career, in Lk's change for the perfect tense.

3. Mt.11,18f called our attention to the use of ἔρχεσθαι as a term characteristic of a messenger's presence. As a SM statement this presence is an epiphanic ephapax.

4. The discussion about Elijah's coming, in Mk.9,11ff par., reinforces the impression gained in Lk.19,10 that Jesus' coming is seen not only as the REALization of Yahweh's promises

but of God's actual presence in the person of Jesus. Lk.19,10 leads us back to Ezek.34,15f: Yahweh, the good shepherd, will seek the lost; Mk.9,13 alludes to Mal.3,22: Yahweh will send Elijah. Both came. The coming of Elijah and the coming of the Son of Man, i.e. the coming of two apocalyptic figures of the end-times, points to the change of aeons, the definite eschatological era has been inaugurated.

5. The demons' cry "did you come (ἦλθες) to destroy us?" (Mk.1,24; Mt.8,29) brings out in a most forceful manner the eschatological character of Jesus' coming, to which the question about Elijah already hinted. There it became clear that ἦλθον + inf. soon meant more than just "my purpose is to ..." but referred to the epiphanic coming and presence of God's awaited envoy (cf. Mt.8,29) who came to inaugurate the Kingdom of God among men.

Summarizing, ἦλθον (+ inf.), which served as a rhetorical means of expressing "my purpose is to..." was soon given a Christological significance. In ἦλθον Jesus' epiphanic coming as the envoy of God found expression; it gained an eschatological mission. This was further heightened there where SM replaced ἦλθον.

## PART TWO

### ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HΛΘON-FORM

After having examined all the ἡλθον-logia within their contexts and considered the significance of ἡλθον within this framework, we shall now examine the uses of the same and analogous forms of speech outside the Synoptics. Three main questions will guide our research: under what particular circumstances and in what milieu was this form of speech employed? what class of individuals and when were they prone to use ἡλθον? and did it have any special significance? Following this analysis we shall reconsider the ἡλθον-logia in the light of the results obtained. Our purpose is to uncover the ultimate meaning of these logia and the ultimate significance of ἡλθον.

The method followed is rather simple. With the aid of concordances, whenever these exist, I have scrutinized every usage of the verb "to come", paying special attention to the first and third persons singular and to those where an inf. follows. I have, furthermore, read all of the Pseudepigraphic and the most important Gnostic literature that was available to me, although for these there exist no concordances.\* Hellenistic literature, which is a world in itself, has been checked only when a concordance or vocabulary index existed. Most collections of papyri have an exhaustive vocabulary index. Verbs closely related to "to come", especially "to send", have also been taken into consideration. For the last chapter I am dependent upon Chapter Six and on a number of studies on the Messianic expectations known to have been alive in First Century A.D. Judaism.

---

\* The paragraphs dealing with the significant uses of "to come" in the Gnostic, Mandeian and Manichean literature, have been omitted in order not to overextend the dissertation and to remain within the limits set to our investigation.

## C H A P T E R     F O U R

### EXTRA-BIBLICAL LITERATURE

In an area of preoccupations that are common among people concerned with the relation between the divinity and man, there are always general conceptions that are more or less common to all --for instance the explanation of creation. This is especially true with respect to many myths. However, this does not mean a priori that influences or dependence of one group on another exist, but rather that similar religious conceptions may be the product of the religious thinking man in general. There can be historical inter-relations, but also individual particular religious ideas and conceptions, and even formulations. That these converge does not necessarily mean that there is a dependence of one on the other. No matter how close religious beliefs may be and regardless how well they resemble one another, one must not jump to the conclusion that the essential of one has been transposed from one to the other: differing faiths vary in their essential beliefs. Thus, it would be better to speak of "correspondences" instead of relations. The essential is preserved; the accidental, such as formulas, is borrowable. However, we should not jump to conclusions. But, in the realm of concepts, unless proofs are conclusive, we should talk of "possibilities". Often there is a psychological or even a logical explanation: "anyone would have thought of this!"

In the NT the belief of God's supremacy is bound to the Jesus-event: it is bound to a concrete person. The substance of the new conception about God and his relation to man had to be put in words that would express it and make it transmittable. It may well have been expressed in borrowed terminology, as it in fact often was, and frequently it is done in "mythical terms": it had to be somehow expressed and given body. The unspeakable had to be spoken of in idiograms. In so far as it is "mythical" (i.e., expresses the unexpressable) we are justified in search-



ing for approaches to other cultural modes of thought, of expression ... it is the origin of the "dress" that is sought in as far as it may not all be wholly original. After all, it is a child of its times and cultural milieu, and mythical modes of expression were commonplace.

Our primary concern will be more with forms than with content since, in our belief, the Christian faith is based on faith in Jesus Christ, in his person as the God-man, and that the Christian faith-content has its own unique personality. Thus, we shall not be concerned with possible similarities (or differences) in content but only with form, and particularly that wherein a divinity or an envoy of the divinity announces "I came in order to ...."

As for religions of Iranian origin, time and place make a direct influence very questionable, but indirect influence is possible. In this and similar culturally and temporally remote religious movements, at best we could speak not of substantial but of a formative influence on already existing beliefs closer in space and time to the NT world, i.e. the former may have helped to give shape to the latter. The writings from Gnostic circles which we possess and know of have in their great majority been influenced to a high degree by Christianity and therefore, there will hardly be a question of an influence of the former on the latter. However, Gnostic writings may reveal the extent to which a given formulation was used and may even have preserved logia otherwise unknown to us (as eg. in the Gospel of Thomas!).

In the religionsgeschichtliche question one ought to keep in mind the time and space possibilities of influences. For this one must go back to the very origins of a given belief, not to its final expression. Influences are generally at the very beginning, at the starting point, and here the influences could be substantial. Thus, we shall be concerned as much with the formula "to come in order to ..." as with the expressions that reveal the hope for such a coming in analogous terms, especially in the world that helped shape that in which Christianity was born.

Finally, neither the idea of a coming savior nor his external form and qualities is peculiar to Judaism. Thus, the religionsgeschichtliche question is not useless.

It is generally conceded that the influences on the NT came from two sectors: (1) the Hellenistic culture and religious movements and (2) the OT and related (esp. Pseudepigraphic) literature circulating in Palestine in the first century A.D. Both currents have in turn been influenced by other remoter ones which, evidently, did not directly have a bearing on the conceptions that worked their way into the NT.

#### A. THE GREEK AND THE HELLENISTIC WORLDS.

After having spent quite a bit of time and having consulted a considerable number of papyri and ancient texts, I must confess that I have found only one text where ἐρχεσθαι + inf. of purpose is used.<sup>1</sup> ἤλθον is indeed rarely found in

<sup>1</sup>That the expression "I have come (in order to...)" was used in remote antiquity is indicated by the Hymn of Victory of Thutmosis III to Amon Re where, in ten consecutive verses, he sings:

I have come, that I may cause thee to trample down the ...

I cause them to see thy majesty as (the lord of radiance)... (Text in J.B. Pritchard, ANET 374f). It is dated from 1470 B.C. and was reused by Sethos I and by Ramses III.

In the Mazdeans' (Zoroastrian) Avesta we read in Gathas XLII, 12 that Mazda, the supreme god, origin of all, is quoted by Zarathustra as having told him:

Je suis venu pour t'entretenir de la sainteté.

And Zarathustra continues,

Je te reconnais esprit de vie, ô Mazda Ahura, car il

[Craosha, a messenger of Mazda] est venu à moi avec le

bon esprit, pour m'apprendre les choses dignes de désir.

(Texts from the transl. by C. de Harlez, Avesta, 3 vols. Paris 1875-1877). See further the Gathas XLII, 15 and Yesht I, 7f; XIII, 41 ("... le pur Zarathustra, chef du monde corporel, tête du monde bipède, venu pour coopérer à chaque oeuvre (de la loi)..."); Yasna X, 1-3. In the Gathas XXXIII, 7; XLIII, 1 we find an invocation for Mazda, in Yesht X, 5 for Mithra, and in Yasna X, 2f for Ashi-Vanuhi, to come to the praying petitioner to satisfy a particular need. The purpose of this invocation is most often the indwelling of the spirit, illumination, the gnose! See eg. Gathas XLIX, 2; XXVIII, 6f; XLII, 12f; Yesht X, 177. Similar invocations will be found also in the Greco-Hellenistic world, for they were common in the ancient world.

Evidently, though interesting as they are, these texts are too distant in time, and the latter in space, that it would be foolhardy to think of an influence of these on the NT.

written texts, and when found it is almost always without special significance. However, I have discovered a number of texts wherein ἔρχεσθαι was used in a cultic or a religious-experience context in order to invoke the divinity's help.

As far back as Homer we find ἔρχεσθαι used in a cultic context. Il. 1,207 depicts the goddess Athena saying "ἦλθον ἐγὼ παύσουσα τὸ σὸν μένος, . . .," and in 23,770 Ulyses prays to Athena "ἐλθέ ποδῖν".<sup>2</sup> In Plato's Leg. IV, 712b we encounter an Athenian praying to a (unnamed) god "ἀκούσας ἱλεως εὐμενῆς τε ἡμῖν ἔλθοι συνδιακοσμήσων..." to which Clinias, with whom he was dialoguing, answered "Ἐλθοι γὰρ οὖν."

The invocation for help, when formulated with the verb ἔρχεσθαι, in many cases contains also an implicit desire to experience an epiphanic manifestation of the deity. Thus, for instance, an Egyptian magical-prayer reads: "... (6) ἐλθέ καὶ φάνηθί μοι, θεὲ Θεῶν, ... (7) εἴσελθε φάνηθί μοι, κύριε, ...."<sup>3</sup> These petitions follow a rather well fixed pattern: ἐλθέ (μοι), followed by the name or an attribute of the divinity invoked, and then the actual personal demand in the vocative. The ἐλθέ (μοι) formula is quite common in the prayers found in magic papyri, a good example of which is the prayer of Astrampsychos to Hermes: "(1) Ἐλθέ μοι, κύριε Ἑρμῇ, ὡς τὰ βερέθη εἰς τὰς κοιλίας τῶν γυναικῶν. (2) ... [ἐλθέ] μοι, κύριε Ἑρμῇ, καὶ δός μοι χάριν τροφὴν νίκην εὐημερίαν ἐπαφροδισίαν προσώπου εἶδος ἀλκὴν ἀ[πὸ] πάντων καὶ πασῶν...."<sup>4</sup> These ἐλθέ (μοι) invocations for the coming of the divinity have been found spread throughout the Hellenistic world;<sup>5</sup> the greatest number of examples of them are to be

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Cer. 360 and the Hymn to Hestia II, 4.

<sup>3</sup>Cited by Reizenstein, Poimandres 27. See also the text cited in ibid., 153.

<sup>4</sup>Cited by Reizenstein, op.cit. 20f. See also the prayer found in an Egyptian magic papyrus cited in ibid. 226, and the Papyrus Leidensis W, given in ibid., 15-18. See further the texts given in K. Preisendanz (ed.), Papyri Graecae Magicae, 2 vols. Leipzig-Berlin 1928, 1931: I, 214f, 296, II, 83f; III, 51, 338f; IV, 1032f, 1031, 1041, 1045, 2746, 2786, 2868; V, 32, 35, 249; VIII, 2ff, 14f.

<sup>5</sup>See L. Weniger, "Theophanien, altgriechische Götteradvente," in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 22(1923/24), 16-57, who gathered a number of examples. See esp. there the Delphic Hymn to Zeus' Muses, Philol. 53 (p.23), the Iakchos song in Aristophanes 324ff (p.26), an "Adventslied" to Dionysius, in Dio Chrys. Or. II, 1.35 (p.28), to Aphrodite in Dionysius, de Comp.c. 23 and to Poseidon in Aristophanes 559 (p.29). ///

found in the Orphic hymns.<sup>6</sup> We also possess texts wherein the actual coming of the divinity is mentioned, as for instance Euripides, Or. 1628, where Apollo says: "ὄρεσθ' ἴν' εἰδῆς οὓς φέρων ἦκω λόγους;" and a hymn to Apollo: "ἦλθες κατὰ καιρὸν ἀνατολὰς ποιο[...] εἰς τὸν σὸν σηκόν."<sup>7</sup> It is not without interest, in this respect, that Josephus also recorded this religious form of invocation. In Ant. IV,46 Moses is pictured as calling on God for intervention: "ἐλθέ, δέσποτα τῶν ὅλων, δικαστὴς μου καὶ μάχης ἀδωροδόκητος,..." -- the same structure we have encountered above. Again, in Ant. XX,90 Izates, the son of Queen Helena of Adiabene, prays to God: "ἐλθέ σύμμαχος οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ μόνον ...." (compare with Mt.6,10).

Among the Hermetic writings,<sup>8</sup> in Hermes Trismegiste XIII, 8 we find a straightforward report of the coming of divine gnosis: "ἦλθεν ἡμῖν γνῶσις θεοῦ ... ἦλθεν ἡμῖν γνῶσις χαρᾶς' ...."<sup>9</sup>

In the most ancient Sibylline Oracle (III), as well as in the later ones, the formulation "to come in order to ..." is never found. However, Clement of Alex. relates, in Strom. I, 108.2 that the Sibylle came to Delphi, and that it is known that people have kept the following saying about its origin, as said to have been spoken by the Sibylle:

/// Interesting is also the Ostrakon n.25029 addressed to Thot, from Ramessidian times (cited by Reitzenstein, Poimandres 19). In the papyri from Ptolemaic times published by U. Wilcken (Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit, vol. I, Berlin-Leipzig 1927) we find three that relate invocations made in dreams for the divinity to come: Papyri n.78 (lines 23ff) and 81 (col. II, lines 17f) where ἐλθέ μοι is used in the invocation, and papyrus n.77 (col. II, line 24) where Ptolemaios relates: ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ ἐπικαλεῖν με τὸν μέγιστον Ἀμμωνά εἶχεν ἀπὸ ] βορεᾶ μου τρίτος ὢν, ἥως παρὰ γ[ί]νηται.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. texts edited by E. Abel, Orphica, Lipsiae-Prague 1885, where the last quarter of almost every hymn has the invocation for the coming of the divinity (ἐλθέ).

<sup>7</sup>Given in F. Preisigke (ed.), Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten, vol. I, Strassburg 1915, n.4127 (lines 15f), see also there the love charm, n.7452 (lines 23ff).

<sup>8</sup>Corpus Hermeticum, ed. A.D. Nock, transl. by A.-J. Festugière, 4 vols. Paris 1945-1954.

<sup>9</sup>Two other texts use ἦλθον but in figurative speech: I.16, "Ὁ Poimandres, vraiment oui, j'en suis arrivé maintenant à un désir extrême (ἐπιθυμίαν ἦλθον) et je brûle de t'entendre," and I.30, "Et me, voici donc, rempli du souffle divin de la vérité (θεοπνεύς γεγόμενος τῆς ἀληθείας ἦλθον)." In these two texts ἦλθον evidently reveals a sense of authority, of self-assurance and decision.

Delphians, worshipers of Apollo whose arrows go far, I have come to reveal to you (ἦλθον ἐγὼ χεῖρους) the mind of Dios the shield-bearer, furious against my brother Apollo.

This is in fact one of the rare texts wherein ἦλθον + inf. of purpose is employed, and in a manner analogous to that found in the NT --indeed the Johannine ἦλθον ἐγὼ (cf. 1,31; 10,10; cf. also 5,7.43).

Finally, we should mention an interesting text from Flavius Josephus, wherein he uses a prophetic manner of speech, to Vespasian when Josephus was a prisoner:

but I come to you as a messenger (ἐγὼ δ' ἄγγελος ἤκω σοι) of greater destinies. Had I not been sent on this errand by God,... (War, III,400).<sup>10</sup>

Conclusion. The verb ἔρχεσθαι, used in a religious context, designates the call for or the actual epiphanic coming of the divinity. It is interchangeable with ἦκειν. The coming of the divinity is for a personal, selfish purpose.<sup>11</sup> However interesting the texts we have referred to may be, they are not of the same form as the ἦλθον (+ inf. of purpose) texts we find in the Gospels. Furthermore, they do not refer to a real concrete historical event of coming but only either to a wish that it take place or to a spiritual "gnostic" experience. Thus, any thought that the NT formula ἦλθον + inf. of purpose expressing a mission or task comes from the Hellenistic milieu is unfounded. I have been unable to find an example in the Greek-Hellenistic literature where a divinity or one of its envoys uses this formula except for Clem. Alex.'s citation of the Sibylle in Delphi.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup>This text has been pointed out and discussed by O. Michel, "Ich komme" (Jos.Bell.III,400), TZ 24(1968), 123f.

<sup>11</sup>On the question of epiphanic appearances see the detailed study by E. Pax, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ 20-99, and our remarks below.

<sup>12</sup>R. Bultmann, with all his interest in the Hellenistic influences on the NT and Christianity at large, has not been able to provide us with a single example of the ἦλθον (+ inf.) formula. None of the examples he and G. Theissen-P. Vielhauer in the Ergänzungsheft of 1971<sup>4</sup> to Syn.Trad. have this form. See further the observations of J. Schneider, art. ἔρχομαι, TDNT II, 666ff. B.G. Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri, Athens 1973, §330 gives the following table:

out of	100	50	106	270 (MSS checked)
from	II BC	I BC	I AD	II AD
ἦλθον is used	1x	2x	7x	18x

There is still one important element in the Greco-Hellenistic world that must be accounted for, and that is their mythology. Greek mythology seems to play on two worlds: the heavenly and the earthly, with a constant interplay between these: divinities are pictured with human traits, leading a quasi-human life. In fact, Greek (and other) mythology is built on the basis of the experiences of life combined with an imagination of ideal situations. Furthermore, frequently what is experienced on earth is explained by some relation with a similar and related occurrence in the Olympian world: cosmogony and theogony are interrelated. Annual celebrations commemorate mythic theophanies and epiphanies.

The well known myth of Prometheus, recounted by Hesiodus, tells us that Prometheus came on earth to gain men for his cause and rob them from Zeus', and thus is punished by the latter. Heracles comes to save the chained Prometheus.<sup>13</sup>

We learn that Hermes was considered the messenger and executer of Zeus' will, so for instance, he guides the Trojans in their war.<sup>14</sup> Dionisius is said to have come on the Parnasus and the Eleusis (cf. Philodamos, 2) and that Athena descended and fought with the heroes of Troy. We also learn that the Greeks thought that Hera, Zeus' spouse, came to aid women that are at the point of child-birth, and that Asclepius, the son of Apollo, came to reveal to the sick persons that invoked him the remedies that would cure them (similarly Serapis, a later rival of Asclepius), as many ex-votos found especially in Epidaurus testify.<sup>15</sup>

Faced with these (and many other) myths one may well suppose that Greek mythology chanted the coming of some of these divinities to earth, among men, for a specific purpose, a sort of "X came to ..." conception. An inkling of this we find in the frequent mention made of divine epiphanies in the Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Homeric Hymns, as well as invocations of

<sup>13</sup>It is interesting to note that the myth of Prometheus led some writers to see a prefiguration of Christ in it, thus eg. Felix-Faure-Goyau, "Un pressentiment païen du calvaire," Le Correspondant, 1914, p.1157ff.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Euripides, Helena 44; Homer, Il. 24, 24, 360f, 677f, etc.

<sup>15</sup>See E.-L. Edelstein, Asclepius, 2 vols, Baltimore 1945.

the sort we have already considered (ἐλθέ).<sup>16</sup>

To all this may be added the current conception of Kings and Emperors as manifestations or incorporations of divinities or even as gods in person.<sup>17</sup> When such dignities made their appearance in a given place for a particular purpose, it would not be strange that at some time they might have used a solemn formula such as "I have come here in order to ...." However, I have not found any written texts containing such a formula.

## B. QUMRAN TEXTS.

The formula "I have come (to)", מָלַךְ, is not found in the published manuscripts from Qumran. As would be expected, the verb מָלַךְ is found used in connection with the future coming of the Messiah. Thus in 4QPatr.Bles.I,1ff it is affirmed that:<sup>18</sup>

There shall not] cease a ruler from the tribe of Judah; ... (3) מְשִׁיחַ בְּיוֹם הַצִּדְקָה, the shoot of (4) David, for to him and to his seed has been given the royal mandate over his people for everlasting generations; ....

and in 1 QS IX,9ff the members of the community<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup>See the study by K. Kerényi, "Apollon-Epiphanien," in *Eranos Jahrbuch* 13(1945), 11-48, and in general Pax, *ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ*, 20-99. In Euripides' *Fragm. 353* (cf. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. A. Nauck, Leipzig 1889), we read: ὁλολύζει', ὡ γυναικες, ὡς ἔλθῃ θεὰ χερσὴν ἔχουσα Γοργόν' ἐπικούρεος πόλει, and in the 2d cent. B.C. Papyrus Ghoran (cf. *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique* 30(1906), 141, lines 3f), Eros Aphrodite supposedly had stated, ἐληλυθα ἀγγελῶν τοιοῦτο πρᾶγμα τι / πρᾶγμα[?] τι τοιοῦτον [ἀ?]γγελῶν [ἐλ]ήλυθα.

<sup>17</sup>On this whole question see H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the gods*, Chicago 1948; and I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, Oxford 1967. Concerning Israel in particular see A.R. Johnson's study *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, Cardiff 1955. We know from coins that (at least some) Roman Emperors adopted divine attributes, thus Augustus appears on a coin as ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ, Tiberius as TIBERIUS CAESAR DIVI AUGUSTI FILIUS AUGUSTUS and as ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΘΕΟΥ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ. In an inscription of the 1st. cent. B.C. we read ANTIOXOS ΘΕΟΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΡΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΕΜΑΗΝ. See the studies by A.D. Nock, "Notes on Ruler-Cult I-IV," *JHS* 48(1928), 21-43, and "Ruler-Worship and Syncretism," *Amer. Journ. Philology* 63(1942), 217-223.

<sup>18</sup>Text published by J.M. Allegro in *JBL* 75(1956), 174f, who indicates for further comparison Tg Onkelos: מְשִׁיחַ בְּיוֹם הַצִּדְקָה and Tg Ps.-Jonathan: מְשִׁיחַ בְּיוֹם הַצִּדְקָה. See also the comments of van der Woude, *Messianische Vorstellungen* 171f.

<sup>19</sup>The English texts, though not a literal translation, are taken from G. Vermes' translation, unless otherwise stated. Concerning this text see also van der Woude, *op.cit.* 75-89.

shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law, (10) to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed

(11) *על בוא נביא ומשיח אהרן וישראל* (cf. Jub.23,11).

This last text, which should be interpreted alongside CD XII, 23f; XIX,10f and XX,1, leads to the interesting observations that, when compared with the latter, the verb *עמד* is used in the same sense as *בוא*. All of these are concerned with the expectation of the Messiah. In CD XII,23-XIII,1 we read:

Those who follow these statutes in the age of wickedness *אחרן וישראל* shall form groups ....

In CD XIX,10f they are told that<sup>20</sup>

These will be saved at the time of seeking, but the remaining ones will be delivered to the sword *בבוא כושח אהרן וישראל* (11)

and CD XX,1 speaks about a time of definite appurtenance to the new covenant:

Those who abandoned the community will not be taken in from the time the Teacher of the Community *על עמוד כושח ומישראל*.

The coming of the Messiah is related to his pardoning mission in CD XIV,18f:

This is the exact statement of the statutes in which [they shall walk] (19) *אחרן וישראל* (19) [עד עמוד כושח] *ויכפר עונם*

In CD VI,10f the coming of a Teacher of Righteousness is announced, also with the verb *עמד*.<sup>21</sup> CD V,5 speaks in similar terms of the past coming of Zadok as the marking point when the Law was unveiled.

We have a group of texts that speak of the coming of the Messiah by direct allusion to the prophecy of Balaam (Num.24, 17ff). Thus, in CD VII,18ff we read:

The star is the Interpreter of the Law (19) who shall come (הבא) to Damascus; as it is written, A Star shall come forth (יד) out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise (קם) (20) out of Israel. The sceptre is the Prince of the whole congregation, and when he comes (בעמוד) he shall smite (21) all the children of Seth.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup>My translation. See the comments of van der Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen* 61-66.

<sup>21</sup>"... they should walk in all the age of wickedness ... until he comes (עד עמד) who shall teach righteousness at the end of days." See the remarks of van der Woude, *op.cit.* 73f.

<sup>22</sup>There is also a relation with 1 Kgs.19,15. See the observations of van der Woude, *op.cit.* 53-58.



We find the same citation of Num.24,17ff in 4 QTest. 12f and 1 QM XI,6f,<sup>23</sup> with the same verbs employed, and including not only the task of treading on the children of Seth but also of smiting the temples of Moab.

In 4QFlor. I,10f a free citation from 2 Sam.7,11-14 is given. We find the verb עָמַד in the sense of בָּוֵא (line 11b) in the comment that follows: "That is the sprout of David, who will come (הַעֹמֵד) with the Seeker of the Law ...."<sup>24</sup>

So far we have only brought out those texts wherein there was a question of the "coming" of the Messiah. There is also a text wherein we find the expression "he comes to ..." (בָּוֵא לְ). In CD VIII,11f we read:

And the head of asps is the chief of the kings of Greece, who הָרַע לַעֲשׂוֹת (12) vengeance upon them.

This reference is found again in XIX,23f. In CD VIII,14f and XIX,27 we also find the combination of בָּוֵא with an infinitive, but does not have the sense of a task to be accomplished: "You enter to possess (בָּוֵא לְרִשֹּׁת) the nations," a reference to Dt. 9,5.

In the Genesis Apocryphon (1 QapGn) XIX,26 we also find the formulation "to come to ...." There we learn that three nobles of the Pharaoh came to Abraham but the purpose of their visit is unknown due to a lacunae in the text:<sup>25</sup>

they came to the place (?) in order to [     ]  
( [     ] לְמִקְדָּשׁ עַד דִּי )

In II,24f, a text with many lacunae, Methuselah speaks to his father Enoch:

my father and my lord, since I [have come (בָּוֵא) to you [     ] and I say to you, 'Do not be angry with me, because I have come (בָּוֵא) here to [you ...]'

One can suppose that, from the construction of the phrases and from what precedes, a purpose for the coming was mentioned, as II,25 suggests. It may have been "to learn the truth about everything ...." (II,22), or something similar.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup>See the remarks of van der Woude, Messianische Vorstellungen, 119-124.

<sup>24</sup>My translation. It refers to the Davidic Messiah; cf. 4 QPatr.Bles.3f as well as Jer.23,5; 33,13.

<sup>25</sup>Text and transl. taken from Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon.

<sup>26</sup>See further the less important but yet interesting texts in XIX,15; XX,21; XXI,23-25.

C. SAMARITAN LITERATURE.

We do possess but a few works of the Samaritans that can be judged to contain traditions that go back at least to the period when Christianity found its origin. The oldest, evidently, is the famous Samaritan Pentateuch, which differs from the ("orthodox") Jewish one in the particular slant it gives to some passages so as to stress the importance of Mt. Gerizim and of Moses as the insuperable prophet.<sup>27</sup> The other two major works are The Samaritan Liturgy ed. by A.E. Cowley,<sup>28</sup> and Memar Marqah's teachings which date from the second century A.D.<sup>29</sup>

In the teachings of Memar Marqah we find the formulation "to come in order to" in the song of VI,§3 (p.221):<sup>30</sup>

The angels came to magnify (אִתּוֹ לְמַרְבֵּה) what was glorious and they were all assembled for Adam.

and in IV,§12 (p.188), where Ex.3,7.8 is cited:

See now! I have seen ... and I have come down to deliver them.

There are also three references to Moses' future coming. In II,§8 (p.63), a poetic song in five verses repeats:

Come in peace, O great prophet Moses ....  
(... בְּשָׁלוֹם וְנִיחָא רַבִּי מֹשֶׁה)

In III,§3 (p.97) it is announced that

He [Moses] will come (יֵאָבֵד) with greatness and will seek out their enemy and deliver Israel, until what the True One said has been manifested.

and in IV,§12 (p.187):

One will come in peace to bring in relief.  
(יֵאָבֵד בְּשָׁלוֹם כְּתוּב דְּרוּחָה)

<sup>27</sup>Unfortunately the Samaritan Pentateuch has not --to my knowledge-- been translated. The existing edition, in Hebrew characters (A.F. von Gall (ed.), Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner (5 parts), Giessen: Verlag von A. Töpelmann, 1914-1918.) offers the problems of a particular (Samaritan) dialect and the absence of a concordance makes research painful for the non-expert.

<sup>28</sup>Published in Oxford, 1909, 2 vols. Unfortunately it was unavailable to me.

<sup>29</sup>Memar Marqah, ed. by J. Macdonald (text and transl.), Berlin 1963

<sup>30</sup>Citations are taken from J. Macdonald's renderings.

Conclusion. In view of the scarce evidence of the use of the expression "to come (to)" there can be no thought of an influence from here. However, it is interesting to note that מָלַךְ, as well as בָּרַךְ --verbs that became interchangeable-- are frequently used in Qumran when referring to the expected coming of the Messiah(s), well in line with the OT usages. This leads us to suspect that, at least in some of the logia, ἡλθόν has in the background the idea of accomplishment, of realization of the messianic hope. The one saying "ἡλθόν ..." is none other than the one it was said that would come, whom the monks of Qumran openly called "the Messiah".

#### D. RABBINIC LITERATURE.

Even though Rabbinic literature is in itself chronologically Post-Christian, many of its traditions are much older, having been transmitted orally during many centuries before they were committed to writing. Their influence on our Gospels is undeniable. However, we can speak of an (oral, not written) influence in a particular form of speech only when it is attested in texts that have a long tradition behind them and are found with certain frequency in these. Only these could reflect a usage that may go back to the First Century.

##### 1. The Mishnah.

In this compilation of old halakic traditions, put down in writing by R. Judah at the turn of the Second Century A.D., we find no significant uses of "to come", and a non-idiomatic "to come" (בָּרַךְ) followed by an infinitive of purpose appears only four times.

In the Tractate Shabbat 16.6 it was taught that<sup>31</sup>

If a gentile came to put out (בָּרַךְ לְכַבּוֹת) the fire they may not say to him, 'Put it out', or 'Do not put it out', since they are not answerable for his keeping the Sabbath. But if it was a minor that came to put it out (בָּרַךְ לְכַבּוֹת) they may not permit him, since they are answerable for his keeping the Sabbath.

In the Tractate Sukkah 2,9 the following question is treated:

---

<sup>31</sup>English text taken from the transl. by H. Danby, The Mishnah, Oxford 1933.

If rain fell, when may he empty out [the Sukkah]? When the porridge would spoil. They propounded a parable: To what can it be compared?<sup>32</sup> to a slave who came to fill the cup (בא למזוג לקונו) for his master and he poured the pitcher over his [the slave's] face.

In Sotah 1,6 we read that R. Judah<sup>33</sup> legislated the following for the woman suspected of adultery:

If she bore ornaments of gold and chains and nose-rings and finger-rings, they were taken from her to shame her. He then brought an Egyptian rope and tied it above her breasts. Any that wished to behold came and beheld (כל הרוצה לראות בא לראות), excepting her bondmen ....

Finally, we find a most interesting text in Edduyoth 8,7:

R. Joshua said: I have received as a tradition from Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, who heard from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, as a Halakah given to Moses from Sinai, that Elijah will not come to declare unclean or clean, to remove afar or to bring nigh .... (אליהו בא לפטמא ולטהר, לרחק ולקרב ....).

In this last text, בא is to be taken literally, as in the preceding ones, i.e., it indicates a displacement. However, the statement, taken as a whole, has the implied meaning of "to have as a purpose to ...," as is clear from the citation of Mal.3,22f which then follows. Thus, Ed.8,7 is to be understood as saying that Elijah will come "not for the purpose of ... [but] to turn the hearts of the fathers etc." (Mal.3,22f, which echoes Mt.10,35 par.). This meaning of בא + inf. is also found in Shebu.1,4.5, where there is question of making atonement.

We find the verb בא followed by an infinitive in other Mishnaic texts, where it constitutes an idiomatic expression. Thus, בא לכלל, in Ned.10,7 has the sense of "to fulfill, keep a vow", and in Sanh.8,1, Demai 2,3, and Hul.9,5 has to sense of "to come within the scope of (a given prescription or law)." In Maas.5,5, Hallah 3,4 and Peah 4,8 we run across the expression בא לעונת המעשרות meaning "the time for tithing".

The use of the formulation בא + inf. is also noteworthy in R.Sh.2,9, where R. Joshua is reported to have told R. Dosa

<sup>32</sup>Hebrew: למה הדבר דומה -- again in Erub.4,6; Nid.9,5 and Zeb.12,8. Compare with Mt.13,24,31,33.

<sup>33</sup>Judah ben El'aj, belonging to the 3d Tannaitic generation (130-160 A.D.).

b. Horkinos: "If we come to inquire (אם באין אנו לדון) the lawfulness of the decisions of the court..., " meaning "if we wish, or decide, to ...."

It is noteworthy that nowhere in the Mishnah is the verb בוא used in connection with an expectation of the Messiah, but is used with respect to Elijah (ער שיבא אליהו) in Ed.8,7; Shek. 2,5; B. Metzia 1,8; 2,8; 3,4.5.

From all the texts pointed out, one can observe that בוא + inf. was used for a variety of idiomatic expressions. This leads us to suspect that that was also the case in our (now in Greek!) ἡθλον + inf. logia, viz. that they originally proceeded from a Semitic manner of locution. Furthermore, the idiomatic uses of בוא + inf. in Ed.8,7 and R.Sh.2,9, lend support to our contention that originally ἡθλον + inf. meant "I have the purpose/intention to ...."

## 2. Mekhilta (to Exodus).<sup>34</sup>

In this halakic midrash to the book of Exodus, which dates from Tannaitic times, it is extremely interesting to observe that the Scriptures are personified. Thus, we read that the Scripture --meaning the text cited-- speaks, shows, explains, brings, and also comes.

The greatest number of passages wherein בוא followed by an infinitive of purpose is found, are precisely those wherein it is said that "the Scripture comes to teach" (בא הכתוב ללמד). Thus, in M. to Ex.12,4, for instance, we read:

Die Schrift (der Vers) kommt dich zu lehren (בא הכתוב ללמדך), dass man stets zum Pesach hinzuzählen und die Hände von ihm zurückziehen kann, ...

and again in M. to Ex.12,11:

Die Schrift kommt, um uns aus der Thora die Rechte Art für die Reisenden zu lehren, ... (בא הכתוב ללמדנו) (דרך ארץ מן התורה).

See the same usage in M. to Ex.12,19.21.29; 13,7.22; 14,31; 21, 14.15.18.19.22.23; 22,4.25. This formula seems to go back at least to R. Akiba since it is found in a declaration quoted from him, in M. to Ex.22,4.

<sup>34</sup>The Mekhilta referred to is that of R. Ishmael, ed. I. H. Weiss (Vienna 1865). The German translation is that done by J. Winter and A. Wünsche, Mekhilta (Leipzig 1909).

However, to teach is not the only function of Scripture mentioned in the Mekhilta. In M. to Ex.12,8 it is said to set a limit:

Die Schrift kommt nur, um eine Grenze zu geben (לֹא בֹא) ....ל (הַכְּתוּב אֵלַי לִיתֵּן תַּחֲוֹם לְבֹרֵךְ), den Morgen des Morgens.

a formulation we find again in M. to Ex.12,10. According to M. to Ex.12,6, Scripture comes to equalize:

Die Schrift kommt, um das erste dem letzten und das letzte dem ersten gleichzumachen (בֹּא הַכְּתוּב לְהַשְׁתַּרְצֵשׁוֹן).

In M. to Ex.13,3 its function is to forbid:

Die Schrift kommt nur, um es zur Nutzniessung zu verbieten (לֹא בֹא הַכְּתוּב אֵלַי לְאַסְרוֹ ; i.e. the leavened food)

Scripture also comes to divide or distinguish. Thus in M. to Ex.21,29 we read that:

Die Schrift kommt zu teilen (scheiden) zwischen (בֹּא) (הַכְּתוּב לְחִלּוֹק בֵּין) einem nicht verwandten Ochsen und einem verwandten.

The same expression, viz. "Scripture comes to divide/distinguish," is also found in M. to Ex.22,2 (between day and night); 22,7 (between protections, and later again, between silver, things and beasts). In M. to Ex.22,5 it is said that

Allein die Schrift kommt, um den Zwang wie den (freien) Willen zu machen ... (בֹּא הַכְּתוּב לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת הָאֵנוֹס כְּרָצוֹן).

M. to Ex.19,17, citing Dt.33,2, refers to God's coming:

zum Sinai kam er [viz. God], um die Israeliten die Thora zu geben (לָסִיּוֹר בֹּא לִיתֵּן תּוֹרָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל). Oder vielleicht sagt sie (die Schrift) nicht so, sondern: Der Ewige kam vom Sinai, um die Israeliten zu empfangen (בֹּא לְקַבֵּל אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל).

In all of these cases, the expression "Scripture comes to..." is idiomatic. It has the sense of "Scripture has the function, task, to..." or "serves the purpose of...." Thus, it is less a personification of Scripture than an idiomatic locution to express the normative function of Scripture. This corresponds to the understanding that God's salvific purpose has been revealed in and through the Torah (cf. M. Ex.19,17!).

The expression "to come in order to" is also found, with the same idiomatic meaning, in M. to Ex.22,5:

die Dornen kommen nur, um ein Mass zu geben (לֹא בֹא קוֹצִים אֵלַי לִיתֵּן שִׁעוֹר)

and in M. to Ex.21,28. Similarly in M. to Ex.21,1, where reference is made to the one "who comes to steal and murder."<sup>35</sup>

בוא, used absolutely is not found in the Mekhilta.

3. The Tosephta. In the Tosephta we do not find any text which might shed any further light on the uses of "to come to...." In B.M.3,25 and Yom Kip.4,1 בא has the strict sense of "coming", i.e. of displacement. The expression ...בא is found quite often in legal contexts to introduce a particular case which then is ruled upon. The expression so frequent in the Mekhilta, "Scripture comes in order to...", is found only once, in Pesah.8,1.

4. The Talmud. In the (Babylonian) Talmud, the expression "to come in order to" is found in a proportionately small number of instances. All the uses of this expression in the first person are banal, non-significant. However, in a number of instances בא + inf. is used idiomatically, and in a few cases has the sense of "to have the purpose/intention", as for instance in Berak.58a: "if a man comes to kill you...;" Shab.18b: "R. Akiba comes only to explain the words of Beth Hillel" meaning that the former's intention is to explain what the school of Hillel had said. The expression "Scripture (or simply "this", referring to the text mentioned) comes to ... (בא חכמה ל...)" which we have been encountering, is also to be found in the Talmud, for instance in Shab.24b, 133a, Yom.4b, Yeb.74a, Sotah 33b.

It must, however, be taken into account the fact that the majority of statements wherein "to come in order to" appears are late traditions. Most are halakic pronouncements, as is to be expected from the very nature of the Talmud.

The most interesting paragraph of all, because it refers to the N.T. and also includes the "to come to" expression, is that found in Shab.116ab. It is a tradition which claims to go back to R. Gamaliel II, and alludes to the logion of Mt.5, 17.<sup>36</sup> A foreigner tells R. Gamaliel:

Since the day that you were exiled from your land  
the Law of Moses has been superseded [lit. taken

---

<sup>35</sup>See further M. to Ex.12,6.49; 14,30, and 23,12. Jeremias, "Schicht" 167, had already pointed out some of these idiomatic usages.

<sup>36</sup>English transl. by I. Epstein, The Babylonian Talmud. On this text see K.G. Kuhn, "Giljonim und sifre minim," in Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche (FS Jeremias), Berlin 1960, 53-58.

away] and another book [Cod. Oxford: and the law of the Evangelium has been] given, wherein it is written, 'A son and a daughter inherit equally.' The next day, he [R. Gamaliel] brought him a Lybian ass. Said he to them, 'Look at the end of the book, wherein it is written, I came not to destroy the Law of Moses nor [var. lec.: but] to add to the Law of Moses (לא למיפחת מן אורייתא דמשה איתא אלא לאוספי על אורייתא) (דמשה איתא), and it is written therein, A daughter does not inherit where there is a son.

In Sanh.98ab there is a discussion about the coming (בוא and אמת are used) of the Messiah. This presents the conception that the Messiah is already on earth but will not make himself known till the end-times (Amorite, 1st. generation view).<sup>37</sup>

Conclusion. The results of my research into the uses of "to come" followed by an infinitive, has been more rewarding in the field of Rabbinic literature than it had been in that of the Greco-Hellenistic world. In fact, the Rabbinic writings contained a number of examples where "to come" + inf. was used as an idiomatic expression, meaning "to have the intention, or purpose to ..." as well as others meaning "to have as a task, or mission to ...." Given that Greek-written literature contained no examples of this idiomatic usage, and that the contrary is the case with the Rabbinic writings, I feel justified in supposing that ἔλθον + inf. is in reality a Greek rendering of a Palestinian idiom, having the above indicated meaning.

---

<sup>37</sup>See esp. E. Sjöberg, *Der Verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*, Lund 1955, 41-98.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE OLD TESTAMENT AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA

#### I. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The OT, being closer to the NT than any other literature, and to which Jesus and the NT owe many of their modes of expression -- not to speak of the continuity and discontinuity between both Testaments -- deserves very special attention. We shall bring forth all the relevant texts where "to come" is used in a significant way and show some analogy to the ἡλ-θον-logia. Our main question is whether the NT ἡλθον form of expression, with all the implications and overtones it can hide, echoes a similar OT usage, or some particular conception as would be the coming of Yahweh.

##### A. יָבֹא / ἡλθον in the OT (MT/LXX).

The expression "I have come in order to...", contrary to a natural expectation, is quite rare in the OT. In the MT, יָבֹא + inf., which is the most natural formulation,<sup>1</sup> occurs only seven times and ἡλθον + inf. ten times in the LXX. Of all these, in Jgs.20,4; 2 Sam.14,15; 19,21(20) and 1 Kgs.18,12, "I have come" has not particular force or significance, and to some extent that is also true of 1 Sam.16,2.5 where the prophet saves himself from Saul's wrath by saying:<sup>2</sup>

I have come to offer a sacrifice to the Lord  
(יָבֹא לְהִזְבִּיחַ / θύσιας τῷ κυρίῳ ἡκω).

From the context, "I have come" refers to Saul's trip, i.e. to movement with a particular purpose.

<sup>1</sup>"I have come" is also expressed by other verbs such as הָיָה, וָיָבֹא, וָיָבֹא, וָיָבֹא (Hif.), הָיָה (Nif.), but these express other nuances. Since ἐρχεσθαι and ἡκεν are the most natural and most frequent translations in the LXX of יָבֹא, I have examined very particularly the uses of these three. In the LXX ἐρχεσθαι translates over 30 Hebrew verbs but over 95% of the time יָבֹא. On the uses of יָבֹא in the OT see esp. H.D. Preuss' art. in the TWAT I, col. 536-568 (esp. 562-568) as well as E. Jenni, "Kommen" im Theologischen Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments, in Wort-Gebot-Glaube, Zürich 1970, 251-261, and F. Schnutenhaus, "Das kommen und erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament," ZAW 76(1964) 1-22.

<sup>2</sup>The English text, unless otherwise stated, is taken from the New English Bible.

In Ex.5,23 Moses complained to the Lord:

Since I first went (״תֵּלַךְ/πεπορεύμαι) to Pharaoh to speak (דַּבַּרְתָּ) in thy name he has heaped misfortune on thy people, and ....

The most interesting texts are found in the Book of Daniel. In 9,23 the archangel Gabriel tells Daniel, as he appears to him:

I have come to pass on to you (דַּבַּרְתִּי לְךָ/ἐγὼ ἦλθον τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι σοι) for you are a man greatly beloved. Consider well the words, consider the vision: ....

and again in 10,14 he tells him:

I have come to explain to you (דַּבַּרְתִּי לְךָ/ἦλθον συγγεῖναι σοι) what will happen to your people in days to come; for this too is a vision for those days. (cf. also 10,12,20)

The case is similar in the LXX version of Dan.11,2 (ἦλθον is absent in the Theodotian recension and the MT).

In these passages, "I have come in order to" is in the mouth of an envoy of God who speaks as one who has a mission to accomplish.<sup>3</sup>

Besides the mentioned texts, there are others wherein "I have/will come" is used in an emphatic manner and a particular mission or purpose is deducible, even though an infinitive is not used. Thus, in Ex.3,13 Moses is told by God: "I have sent you (דַּבַּרְתִּי לְךָ, again in v.14): ...," to which he replies:

If I go (אֲנִי הָיִדָה/ἐγὼ ἐλεύσομαι) to the Israelites and tell them that the God of their forefathers has sent me (דַּבַּרְתִּי לְךָ/ἀπέσταλκεν)....

In 1 Sam.17,45 Goliath is told by David:

I have come (אֲנִי הָיִדָה/ἐγὼ παρέρχομαι) against you in the name of the Lord of Hosts, ....

which resembles Balaam's manifestation to Balak, in Num.22,38:

I have come (אֲנִי הָיִדָה/ἦκω), as you see. ...whatever the word God puts into my mouth, that is what I will say.

and the response of the mysterious "man standing in front of Joshua with a drawn sword" to his query, in Jos.5,14:

I am here (אֲנִי הָיִדָה/παρεγέρχονα) as captain of the army of the Lord.

<sup>3</sup>The verb אָלַךְ + inf. in persons other than the first person sing. is not rare in the OT; see for instance Gen.19,9; Ex.12,23; Nm.4,3; Jgs.19,15; 1 Sam.26,15; 2 Sam.3,2; 13,5; 2 Kgs.4,1b; Isa.16,12; Jer.42,22; Ezek.14,7; 38,13; etc.

In these last two texts 'תלל has a very official tone; it is solemn and authoritative.

Nehemiah relates in 2,9.11 his activity as an envoy of Artaxerxes to his people:

Then I came (אילל/הלל) to the governors of the province Beyond the River, and gave them the king's letter. ... I came to Jerusalem ... and I told no one what my God had put into my heart to do for Jerusalem. (cf. also 13,6.7)

In Job 1,15b.16b.17b the messenger tells him:

לִּי הָיָא הַיּוֹם יָגֵן יְהוָה בְּעַדִּי / ἐγὼ μόνος ἦλθον τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι σοι.

In these texts, "I have come" is found in the mouth of special envoys sent with a particular mission to accomplish. In this perspective the exchange between Joab and Absalom, in 2 Sam.14,32 is most instructive:

Absalom told Joab: "Behold, I sent (הלהל / ἀπέστειλα) word to you, 'Come (אל/הכ) here, that I may send (הלהל / ἀποστείλω) you to the king, to ask, 'Why have I come (תלל/הלל) from Geshur?...'" Then Joab went (אילל/העלה) to the king and told him;....

## B. The Coming of Yahweh.

There are a good number of texts where אילל/העלה is used in connection with Yahweh's theophanic appearances and a number of prophecies about his future coming to his people.

1. Yahweh's Theophanic Appearances. There are some texts wherein Yahweh speaks in the first person alluding to his dynamic appearance. Thus Yahweh in Ex.20,24b tells Moses:

Wherever I cause my name to be invoked, I will come (אילל/העלה) to you and bless you. (cf. Mt.18,20!)

Again, in Ex.19,9, speaking to Moses Yahweh makes reference to his theophanic appearance:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>The difference between a Theophany and an Epiphany is not always easy to draw. In great traits it can be said that a Theophany refers to God's coming to an individual who serves as a medium between God and his people; the manner of his apparition may vary (eg. in a fire, wind, etc. or personally). It is momentaneous and has for purpose to communicate a message. In an Epiphany we find an aspect of concreteness, even humanness, and is marked by a prolonged presence of the divinity; its purpose is primarily to procure salvific help. See J. Jeremias, Theophanie. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung (WMANT, 10), Neukirchener Verlag, 1965, and E. Pax, EPHANEIA, München 1955, as well as F. Schnutenhaus, "Das kommen und erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament," ZAW 76 (1964), 1-22.

I am now coming to you (תִּיָּנָה אֲנִי בָּא / ἐγὼ παρὰγίνομαι) in a thick cloud, so that I may speak to you in the hearing of the people, and their faith in you may never fail.

In Hos.11,9 Yahweh assures Ephraim:<sup>5</sup>

I will not come (אֵלֶיךָ / εἰσελεύσομαι) in the city to destroy.

A similar metaphorical mode of speech is found in Ezek.16,8:

Again I came by (אֵלֶיךָ / διῆλθον) and say that you [the chosen people] were ripe for love. (cf. Isa.50,2a).

2. Yahweh's Messengers. The verb אֵל / ἔρχεσθαι is used with respect to apparitions of angels in Gen.19,1 (to Lot), Jgs.6,11 (sat at Ophrah); and 13,9 (to Manoah; LXX reads παρεγένετο and B reads ἦλθεν) Job 1,14-18 (cf. v.15b,16b, and 17b).

In Dan.10,12 an angel comforts Daniel:

Do not be afraid, Daniel, ..., your prayers have been heard, and I have come (אֵלֶיךָ / εἰσῆλθον; Theod. ἦλθον) in answer to them.

and in 10,20 Michael asks Daniel:

Do you know why I have come (אֵלֶיךָ / ἦλθον) to you?....

In these texts "I have come" has a very official and authoritative tone in the mouth of a messenger.

We also learn of Yahweh's "comings" in dreams. Thus he appeared to Abimelech (Gen.20,3), to Laban (Gen.31,24), to Balaam (Num.22,9.20), and to Samuel (1 Sam.3,10), always to convey a message.

Manoah's wife tells him, in Jgs.13,6, that "A man of God came (אֵל / ἦλθεν) to me;.... he said to me...." More directly, the widow of Zarephthah faces "the man of God" Elijah with the cry:

You came (אֵלֶיךָ / εἰσῆλθες) here to bring my sins to light and kill my son! (1 Kgs.17,18; cf. Mt.8,29b par).

Malachi prophecies, in 3,22f:

I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. He will reconcile fathers to sons and sons to fathers [cf. Mt.10,35/Lk. 12,53!], lest I come (אֵלֶיךָ - בָּא / μὴ ἔλθω) and put the land under a ban to destroy it.

---

<sup>5</sup>My translation.

It is most interesting to note that no prophet ever says "I came," and that there is not even mention of his coming but, on the contrary, there is frequent reference to his having been sent.<sup>6</sup> The prophets are conscious of their having been sent by Yahweh, as indicated especially by Jeremiah's remarks in 23,28; 26,12.15; 43,2; etc.

3. Witnesses to Yahweh's Presence. Moses speaks twice of the theophanic presence in terms of God's having come. In Ex. 20,20 he tells the people, after his descent from the mountain:

Do not be afraid; God has come to test you,...  
(וְלֹא תִירָאוּ כִּי בָּחַן אֱלֹהִים אֶתְכֶם / παρὰπειρῆσθαι)

and in his farewell discourse, shortly before his death, Moses begins thus:

The Lord came (אֱלֹהִים) from Sinai; he shone forth from Seir. He showed himself from Mount Paran,...(Dt.33,2)

The Philistines, when they realized that the Ark of the Covenant had been brought to the camp of the Israelites and heard their shouts of joy, exclaimed:

A god has come (אֱלֹהִים) into the camp. We are lost! No such thing has ever happened before (1 Sam.4,7).

Here Yahweh's presence in the Ark is localized. The permanent presence of God in the Temple is explained by Ezechiel thus:

No man may enter it [the outer gate of the sanctuary], for the Lord the God of Israel has entered it (וְלֹא יָבִיאוּ בָּהּ אֲנָשִׁים / εἰσελεύσεται) (44,2; cf. also 43,4).

The texts we have relevated could hardly have been in the background of the NT ἡλθον-sayings. In fact, they have found no echo in the NT. They are for the most part addressed to an individual and their content is of a different nature. The NT ἡλθον-logia do not copy nor concretize the OT past appearances of Yahweh. It remains for us to ask whether they actualize OT prophetic announcements of the future coming of God.

---

<sup>6</sup>See Gen.45,5; Ex.3,10-16; 7,15f; Jgs.6,14; 2 Sam.7,15; 24,12; 1 Kgs.21,18f; 2 Kgs.20,5; Isa.6,9; 7,3; 48,16f; Jer. 1,7.17; 2,2; 26,12.15; Zech.2,13; 4,9; 6,15.

### C. The Announcements of the Future coming of God.

It is noteworthy that a conception of the future coming of God developed around the Exilic time. Past comings of God are rarely mentioned, as we have seen, and this is mostly because there existed in pre-Exilic times a strong consciousness of the perennial presence of God. It was only with the menace and actual experience of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Exile that a questioning of God's protective presence developed. From that time on a more concrete coming of God in the near future was prophetically announced and expected. Thus, we are touching into the realm of messianic expectations.

1. Whence Yahweh comes. The coming of God is announced in Theophanic terms in Isa.30,27a:

See, the name of the Lord comes (אל/עה) from afar, his anger blazing,....

and in 60,1:

Arise, Jerusalem, rise clothed in light; your light has come (אור אל/היך) and the glory of the Lord shines over you. (cf. Lk.1,78; Jn.1,14).

Ezekiel in 43,2, describing his prophetic vision, mentions:

I beheld the glory of the God of Israel coming (אל/ה) from the east.

while Habakuk indicates that

God comes (אל/ה) from Teman, the Holy One from Mount Paran;... (3,3; cf. Dt.33,2).

Further, Isa.63,1 rhetorically asks:

Who is this coming (אל/ה) from Edom, coming from Bozrah,....?

and the Psalmist sings:<sup>7</sup>

Lift up your heads, you gates, ... , that the king of glory may come in (אל/ה) (24,7.9)

Zechariah (14,5b) in turn precises that

The lord my God will appear (אל/ה) with all the holy ones. (cf. Mt.25,31; 1 Th.1,7; Jude 14)

2. Yahweh will come to Judge. A number of texts announce a future coming of God with the purpose of judging. This is very bluntly stated by the Psalmist in 96,13 and 98,9:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Psalms are cited according to the MT.

<sup>8</sup>It is most interesting to note that the LXX has translated the same Hebrew verb, אור, in two identical sentences, by two different verbs. In Ps.96(95),13 it is translated ///

He comes, he comes (עָלָה/עָלָה) to judge the earth....  
(cf. Ps.9,8; Acts 17,31; Apoc.19,11)

and in the liturgical hymn of 1 Chr.16 was sung:

... let the trees of the forest shout for joy before  
the Lord when he comes to judge (עָלָה עָלָה/עָלָה)  
קַיִן) the earth (v.33).

Likewise Isa.3,14:

The Lord will come in judgment (עָלָה עָלָה/עָלָה)  
against the elders of his people and their officers.<sup>9</sup>

and Hos.10,10:

I will come (עָלָה/עָלָה [B omit] עָלָה) against the  
wayward people to punish them;....

Ezechiel, speaking as God's mouthpiece, says:

I will bring about such ruin [on Israel] as never was  
before, until the rightful sovereign comes (עָלָה עָלָה/עָלָה)  
עָלָה עָלָה / עָלָה עָלָה). Then I will give him all.  
(21,32)

That is also the idea expressed in Isa.66,15:

For see, the Lord is coming in fire (עָלָה עָלָה/עָלָה עָלָה)  
עָלָה), ... , to strike home with his furious anger,  
(cf. 2 Th.1,8)<sup>10</sup>

More nuanced are Habakuk 2,2f:

(2) Write down the vision, inscribe it on tablets,...,  
(3) for there is still a vision for the appointed time.  
At the destined hour it will come in breathless haste,  
it will not fail. If it delays wait for it; for when  
it comes will be no time to linger.

and Ps.50,3:

Our God is coming (עָלָה/עָלָה) and will not keep si-  
lence.

3. Yahweh will come to Save. In other texts there is ques-  
tion of God coming to his people in order to bring them sal-  
vation, which was an expectation developed in Exilic times  
and nourished hopes. The bridge between his future purpose of  
judging and of saving is put forward in Isa.35,4:

/// by עָלָה and in Ps.98(97),9 by עָלָה. This suggests that  
both verbs were considered as interchangeable, even if עָלָה is  
used especially in cultic and epiphanic contexts.

<sup>9</sup>My translation.

<sup>10</sup>This text should be related to Mal.3,19: "Behold the day  
[MT: עָלָה; B,S,L,C: עָלָה; A,Q: עָלָה] comes (עָלָה/עָלָה), burn-  
ing like an oven, when all the arrogant and all evildoers will  
be stubble;...."

See, your God comes (אֵלֶיךָ/not in LXX!) with vengeance,  
with dread retribution he comes to save you (אֵלֶיךָ אֵלֶיךָ  
בְּכָבוֹד / αὐτὸς ἥκει καὶ σῶσαι).

More specifically, God's coming to save is proclaimed in Isa.  
62,11:

Tell the daughter of Zion, Behold your deliverance  
has come (אֵלֶיךָ יְשׁוּעָה / ὁ σωτήρ παραγίνεται).

A text that should be related to Zechariah 2,14(10 LXX):

Shout aloud and rejoice, daughter of Zion; I am coming  
(אֵלֶיךָ / ἐρχομαι), I will make my dwelling  
among you, says the Lord.

and Zech.9,9 (cf. Mt.21,5/Jn.12,15):

Rejoice, rejoice, daughter of Zion, ... , for see,  
your king is coming (אֵלֶיךָ / ἐρχεται) to you, his cause  
won, his victory gained, humble and mounted on an  
ass,....

as well as Isa.59,19f:

(19) So from the west men shall fear his name, fear  
his glory from the rising of the sun; for it shall  
come like a shining river, the spirit of the Lord hovering  
over it, (20) come (אֵלֶיךָ) as the ransom of  
Zion and of all in Jacob who repent of their rebellion.  
(cf. Rom.11,26).

Besides the two particular purposes seen in a future coming  
of God, to judge and to save, a third one is mentioned by  
Isa.40,10a:

Here is the Lord God coming (אֵלֶיךָ / ἐρχεται) in might,  
coming to rule with his right arm.

In the same vein is Isa.66,18:

I am coming ([ל]אֵלֶיךָ; A, it, Tg and Syr: אֵלֶיךָ / ἐρχομαι)  
to gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come  
and shall see my glory.

While Hosea exhorts his people:

... it is time to seek the Lord, seeking him till he  
comes (אֵלֶיךָ - עַד / ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν) and gives you just measure  
of rain. (10,12b).

the Psalmist cries:

when will you come (אֵלֶיךָ / ἔξαις) to me? (101,2).<sup>11</sup>

Ps.118,26 is the only text wherein the absolute אֵלֶיךָ / ὁ  
ἐρχόμενος is used, sung at Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem in Mt.  
21,9/Lk.19,38 (cf. also Mt.23,39/Lk.13,35).

There remain three other texts that have been variously

---

<sup>11</sup>My translation.



variously interpreted. In Dan.7,13 the prophet relates:

I saw one like a son of man coming (הָיָה כְּבֶן אָדָם בָּרֹחַ /LXX:  
ἦλθετο; Theod.: ἐρχόμενος) with the clouds....

In the puzzling phrase from Jacob's farewell prophetic speech before his death, in Gen.49,10, he tells his children:

The sceptre shall not pass from Judah,  
nor the staff from his descendants,  
הָיָה שִׁבְטִי בְיָדָךְ / ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ  
and the obedience of the nations is his.<sup>12</sup> (cf. Hbr.7,  
14).

To this text should be related the oracle of Balaam:<sup>13</sup>

I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near: a  
star shall come forth (כֹּכַב יֵצֵא מִיַּעֲקֹב) out of Jacob, a  
comet arise from Israel. (Num.24,17; cf. Mt.2,2)

and Ezek.21,32 (cf. supra).

Finally, in Mal.3,1f, a text cited in Mt.11,3.10/Lk.7,19.  
27; Mk.1,2/Lk.1,76 and Jn.3,28, we find evidence of the inter-  
changeability of the concept of God's coming and his appear-  
ing, as well as the closeness between the messenger sent and  
the Lord who comes:

(1) Look, I am sending my messenger who will clear a  
path before me. Suddenly the Lord whom you seek will  
come (אֲנִי / ἔρχομαι) to his temple; the messenger of the  
covenant in whom you delight is here, here already  
(אֲנִי-הֵנָּה / ἔρχεται), says the Lord of Hosts. (2) Who can  
endure the day of his coming (אִישׁ / εἰσόδου)? Who can  
stand firm when he appears (אִישׁ / ὀρθοστάς)?

We may conclude with H.D. Preuss that "Israel erwartet  
das endgültige Kommen des gekommenen und kommenden JHWH."<sup>14</sup>  
Even if it is not impossible that this expectation be given an  
actualizing expression in Jesus' ἦλθεν, it is almost impossible  
to prove that it really does so. The texts we possess are not  
very numerous and, with the exception of Gen.49,10; Num.24,17;  
Dan.7,13; Ps.118,26; Zech.9,9 and Mal.3,1f, are neither cited  
nor alluded to. However, precisely these exceptions, especially

<sup>12</sup>The crux interpretum is the word הָיָה, for which many  
interpretations and meanings have been put forward. See, besides  
the standard commentaries, the studies by W.L. Moran, "Gen 49,  
10 and its use in Ez 21,32," Bib 39(1958), esp. 405-416, and  
L. Sabottka, "Noch Einmal Gen 49,10," Bib 51(1970), 225-229.  
The variant readings are listed by Moran, art. cit. 414.

<sup>13</sup>See the study by J. Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah  
and the Messianic Entry," JBL 80(1961), esp. 56f.

<sup>14</sup>Preuss, art. N11, TWAT I, col.568.

the citation of the only text having the absolute  $\aleph\lambda\theta\omicron\epsilon\chi\acute{o} - \mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (Ps.118,26) and the expression "the Son of Man has come..." which alludes to Dan.7,13, suggest that behind the NT  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$  lies the veterotestamentary expectation of a final and unsurpassable personage that would come to inaugurate the Messianic era.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup>The coming of Wisdom ( $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ), to which Wis.7,7; Sir.24,8. 10b.11 and 4 En.42,2 refer, is so rarely mentioned that -- in spite of its personalization -- it cannot be said that behind the NT  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$  lies the coming of Wisdom.

The coming of "the day of the Lord" should also be pointed out, in as much as it is another expression for the coming of the Messiah. See Joel 3,4(2,31 LXX); Zech.14,1; Mal.3,23 (4,5 LXX); Isa.13,9.

Besides the texts we have cited, wherein there is a direct usage of "to come", there are some wherein the verb  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  ( $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  /  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$ ) is used -- a verb that in Qumran will have great importance in relation to the Messianic expectation. In the past God raised judges (Jgs.2,16.18), prophets (Am.2,11; Jer.29,15), and even is said to have raised a king to himself (1 Kgs.14,14). God is also called to rise ( $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  /  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  or  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$ ), in the sense of "to come" and help: Num.10,35; Jgs.18,9; Jer.2,27 and esp. the Pss.3,8; 7,7; 9,20; 10,12; etc.; 2 Chr.6,41. The sense of "to come" is also present in Ps. 12,6; Isa.14,22; 33,10; and "to bring/cause to come salvation" in Jgs.2,16; 3,9.15. However, there are three texts in particular that deserve special attention for their messianic outlook. In Dt.18,15.18, the key text (v.15-19) for the Samaritans' Messianic hope, Moses says to his people: "(v.15) The Lord your God will raise up ( $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  /  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$ ) a prophet from among you like myself, and you shall listen to him. ... [And Moses reports that God told him:] (18) I will raise up ( $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  /  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$ ) for them a prophet like you, one of their own race, and will put my words into his mouth." (Cf. Mt.17,5/Mk.9,7; Lk.24,27; Jn.1,21.45; 3,34a; 5,46; 6,14; 7,40; 12,49f; Acts 3,22; 7,37). The second important text announces the royal Messiah: Jeremiah tells his people: "The days are now coming, says the Lord, when I will make a righteous Branch spring ( $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  /  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$ ) from David's line, a king who shall rule wisely, maintain law and justice in the land." (23,5 cf. 1 Cor.1,30). Finally, Jer.30(37),9: "they [the foreigners] shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I will raise up ( $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$  /  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron$ ) for them" (cf. also Am.9,11; the theme of service is antithetical to Mk.10,45 par.!).

Finally, a note concerning the Targums. I have checked the Tg Onkelos, for which a concordance exists, as well as Neofiti 1 thanks to the help of Prof. A. Diez-Macho who sent me the pages of the forthcoming concordance which contained the verbs  $\aleph\lambda\theta\omicron$  and  $\aleph\lambda$ . I found however no special use of "to come" which might be of interest to us or which was not already in the MT. The only relevant and interesting passage in the Targums Jerushalmi I and Neofiti 1 which has come to my attention has been the haggadic expansion to Gen.18,2, concerning which, see the next page. Unfortunately research in the ///

Note on the Targums to Gen.18,2.

In the haggadic expansion which we find in the Targums Jerushalmi I (=TJ I) and Neofiti 1 to Gen.18,2 --absent in the Tg Onkelos,-- the three men that Abraham saw standing near him are pictured as three envoys of God, each having a very concrete mission, which tradition there describes as: "to announce (to Abraham) that Sarah will bear him a child," "to save Lot" and "to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah."

Tg Jerushalmi I (Gen.18,2)

... אשתלחו לצורך תלת מיליא ...  
 כשתליחא ליתרון מילא חד  
 חד אתא למבשרא  
 ... שרה ילדה ...  
 וחד אתא  
 למשיבא ית לוט ...  
 וחד אתא  
 למיהפך ית סדום ....

Tg Neofiti 1 (Gen.18,1)

... אשתלחו לתלת מילין ...  
 ישתלח בידה יתיר כון הדה מילה  
 מלאכא קומא ישתלח למבשרא  
 ... די שרה ילדה ...  
 ומלאכא תניינה אשתלח  
 לכושזבה ללוט ...  
 ומלאכא תליתאה אשתלח  
 למיפך סדום ....

What is quite instructive, and concerns our particular study, is the interchangeability in the above texts between "he came" and "he was sent": while the TJ I says that these envoys "came" (תאת) the Tg Neofiti says that they were sent (אשתלח). The use of אשתלח, and not אתא, in Neofiti is intentional, in view of the sovereignty of God. This phenomenon of alternating between "to come" and "to be sent" brings immediately to mind that of Mk.1,38 (ἐξῆλθεν) -- Lk.4,43 (ἀπεστάλην) and shows once more how easily one passed from the one to the other; it underlines the complementarity of the two standpoints --which is especially clear in TJ I where both verbs are used. The expression אתא למשיבא (he came to save) in TJ I deserves attention inasmuch as it finds an echo in Lk.9,56a and 19,10: ἦλθεν (earlier than "the SM came") σῶσαι. Coupled with the mission of the third envoy, viz. לכויהפך (to destroy), this haggadah reminds us of Lk.9,56a where, in a similar perspective (within the context of the pericope 9,52-56), there is also a question of saving/delivering-destroying/annihilating.

/// Targums has been greatly handicapped by the non-existence of concordances and my limited familiarity with Aramaic.

## II. THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.

The Pseudepigraphic literature presents the interest which a literature that originated in Palestine, in its greatest part around the time when Christianity came into being, can present.<sup>1</sup> Many Pseudepigrapha have suffered Christian interpolations, which indicates that it offered a definite interest to the early Christians. Being sufficiently close to the NT times, it gives us a good source to search for the possibility that a recurrent "to come in order to" pattern of speech is present in it.

At the outset it should be noted that, since most of the Pseudepigrapha is interested in painting divine revelations, there is a rather frequent mention of the "coming" of angels and other messengers to a given OT personage to mediate the revelation intended by God or to bring some specific message.<sup>2</sup>

### A. "I have come in order to" Texts.

The formula "to come in order to" is very rare in the past tense. Four examples I have found are:

- The Apoc. of Moses 16,3, where the devil tells the serpent:  
I hear that thou art wiser than all the beasts,  
and I have come to counsel thee ...;
- 4 Ezra 6,30, where the angel Uriel announces to Ezra:  
These things came I to show thee this night ...;
- and again, 4 Ezra 7,2:  
Up, Ezra, and hear the words that I have come to  
speak unto thee ... (cf. Lk.1,19; Apoc.22,6.16!);
- and the Test. Job 34,20, where Eliphaz' friends tell Job:  
ἐληλύθαμεν (γὰρ) ἵνα παραμυθισώμεθα αὐτὸν....<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion about the origin, date of composition, and MSS, see esp. A.-M. Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament, Leiden 1970.

<sup>2</sup>An angel comes to Baruch (3 Bar.1,3; 8,1; 11,4; Paralip. Jeremioi 6,15), to Ezra (4 Ez.6,30; 7,2; 10,29) to Abimelech (Paralip. Jeremioi 6,2). The archangel Michael comes to Judas Maccabee (1 Ez.90,14, cf. 2 Mac.11,68), to Abraham (Test. Abrah. II and often) to Adam (1 En.71,14; Book of Adam and Eve 25,3). Angels come to judge Adam (Apoc. Moses 22,2) and to bury Eve (43,1). Further, death (personified) comes to Abraham (Test. Abrah. (A) XVI); the word of God came to Baruch (10,1; 13,1); "The Lord came to Abram in a dream" (Jub.14,1), and also to Paradise (Apoc. Moses 8,1); etc.

<sup>3</sup>S.P. Brock (ed.) Testamentum Iobi, Leiden 1967.

## B. The Future Coming of the Messiah.

In this literature there are a number of places and occasions in which there is a specific mention of the future coming of God. Thus, for instance in 2 En.32,1 God says to Enoch:<sup>4</sup>

Then I can take thee at My second coming.

and in 1 En.91,7 Methuselah says that:

the holy Lord will come forth with wrath and chastisement to execute judgment on earth.<sup>5</sup>

These refer to a coming after that of creation (cf. 58,1f -- version A). In 2 Bar.48,39:

the judge shall come and will not tarry,

and in 4 Ez.12,32:

This is the Messiah, who shall spring from the seed of David, and shall come and speak unto them; he shall reprove them for their ungodliness, rebuke them ....

In the first Parable of 1 En.1(v.3-9) it is prophesied:

(3) The Holy Great One will come forth from His dwelling, And the eternal God will tread upon the earth (even) on Mount Sinai, ....

(9) And behold! He cometh with ten thousands of His holy ones to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all the ungodly: and to convict all flesh ....

V.3 should be compared with Jer.10 in The Lives of the Prophets:<sup>6</sup>

The Lord departed from Sinai into heaven, and he will again come with might (ἐλεύσεται ἐν δυνάμει). (cf. 2 Mac. 2,8)

In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs we find several interesting sayings that reveal the Messianic expectations in terms of coming. In the T. Levi 5,2 God says to Levi:

I have given thee the blessings of the priesthood until I come and sojourn (ὥς ἐλθὼν κατοικήσω) in the midst of Israel. (cf. Zech.2,14!)

The angels inform Levi, in 8,11:

thy seed shall be divided into three offices, for a sign of the glory of the Lord who is to come (ὁδοῦ κυρίου ἐπερχομένου).

<sup>4</sup>The English translations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from R.H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol.II: Pseudepigrapha, Oxford 1913.

<sup>5</sup>See further 1 En.90,15.18; Paralip. Jeremίου 6,6; 2 Bar. 72,2.

<sup>6</sup>C.C. Torrey (ed.), The Lives of the Prophets. Greek Text and Translation, Philadelphia 1946. It is dated by Torrey before 80 A.D. See also Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes 89f.

In the T. Juda 22,2, the Patriarch says to his children:

among men of another race shall my kingdom be brought to an end, until the salvation of Israel shall come. (ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ; cf. also T. Levi 2,11).

Naphtali, in 4,5, says to his children:

And the Lord shall scatter them [the chosen people] upon the face of the earth, until the compassion of the Lord shall come (ἄλγεις οὐ ἐλθῇ τὸ σπλάγχνον κυρίου), a man working righteousness and working mercy unto all them that are afar off, and to them that are near.

This text finds an echo in Mt.9,13. In the late Testament of Abraham<sup>7</sup>, Recension A, XIV, Michael explains to Abraham why a soul he saw was "abjudged to the middle" of the scale:

Because the judge found that its sins and its righteous deeds were equal, and he neither handed it over to judgment nor to salvation, until the time when the judge of all comes (ἕως οὐ ἐλθῇ ὁ κριτὴς τῶν πάντων).

Besides these texts, two others which express the same idea but use the verb "to raise" (ἀνίστημι) should be mentioned because of their importance. These are the T. Juda 24,1 and T. Simeon 7,2. In the T. Juda 24,1 a clear allusion to Num. 24,17 is made:<sup>8</sup>

And after these things shall a star arise (ἀνατελεῖ) (to you from Jacob in)<sup>9</sup> for peace. And a man shall arise (ἀναστήσεται) (from my seed)<sup>10</sup>, like the sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness. (cf. also T. Levi 18,3).

Simeon tells his children, in T. Sim.7,2 that:

the Lord shall raise (ἀναστήσει) up from Levi as it were a High-Priest, and from Judah as it were a King (God and man); He shall save all (the Gentiles and)<sup>11</sup> the race of Israel.

This terminology and allusions we shall find again in Qumran.

<sup>7</sup>M.E. Stone (transl.), The Testament of Abraham, Philadelphia 1972. The Hebrew Vorlage is acc. to Denis, Introduction aux Pseudepigraphes 89f., probably of the first half of the 1st cent. A.D.

<sup>8</sup>On the use and importance given to Num.24,17 in the Test. of the XII Patriarchs and Qumran see M. Philonenko, Les interpolations chrétiennes 8-12.

<sup>9</sup>Absent in the Armenian MSS, as is the sentence that follows "And a man shall arise...", but the Greek MSS are to be preferred.

<sup>10</sup>For R.H. Charles, n. ad loc., it is an interpolation, to the contrary Philonenko, op. cit. 10.

<sup>11</sup>This and the previous parenthetical expression are interpolations acc. to Charles, but only the 2d one is an interpolation for Philonenko, op. cit. 7

We find Christian interpolations in T. Asher 7,3, the Vita Adae et Evae 42,2-5, and the Paralip. Jeremiu 9,15f. 20f., in which there is mention made of the coming of Jesus in futuristic terms. Thus, in the T. Asher 7,3 we find Mt.11, 18 echoed:

Until the Most High shall visit the earth, coming Himself [as man, with men eating and drinking (ὡς ἀνθρώπου, μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων)]<sup>12</sup>, and breaking the head of the dragon in the water. (cf. also T. Simeon 6,5.7).

In the Vita Adae et Evae 42, we find the following interpolation:

When five thousand five hundred years have been fulfilled, then will come upon earth the most beloved king Christ, the son of God, to revive the body of Adam and with him to revive the bodies of the dead. (3) He Himself, the Son of God, when he comes will be baptized in the river of Jordan, then he will anoint from the oil of mercy all that believe in Him. (v.2f.).

Finally, in the Paraleipomena Jeremiu 9,15f we read that:<sup>13</sup>

after these things there shall be 477 years more and he comes (ἐρχεται) to earth.

and in 9,20f:

For he shall come (ἐλεύσεται) and he will go out and choose for himself twelve apostles to proclaim the news among the nations -- he whom I have seen adorned by his father and coming (ἐρχόμενον) into the world on the Mount of Olives -- and he shall fill the hungry souls. (21) When Jeremiah was saying this concerning the son of God -- that he is coming (ὅτι ἐρχεται) into the world -- the people became very angry ....

What may we conclude? evidently that the formula "to come in order to" is so rare in this literature that it is useless to think of an origin in this milieu!

## CONCLUSION.

From our research into the non-NT uses of the formula "to come (to...)" we can draw the following conclusions:

<sup>12</sup>Cf. M. Philonenko, Les interpolations chrétiennes, 40.

<sup>13</sup>R.A. Kraft and A.-E. Purinton (ed. and transl.), Paraleipomena Jeremiu, Philadelphia 1972. Dated ca. 130 A.D., of Jewish origin. Cf. also Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes 74f. See further the late (3-4 cent. A.D.) Oracula Sibyllina VIII, 37f. 218.256.326f which speak of the comings of Jesus in futuristic terms, using ἔξει.

1. In the Hellenistic religious movements, the formula under study is most rarely found so that one could not speak of influences. It should be kept in mind that almost every religion envisages a contact between the divinity/ies and man. Thus, it is not surprising to find a frequent invocation "come (ἔλθε)!" addressed to a divinity. However, since we rarely find a reference to an actual coming of a divinity or an envoy, it would be foolhardy to think that the NT "I have come (in order to...)" formula has its root here. Moreover, there is no evidence, to our knowledge, of a historical (in the strict sense) spatio-temporal coming of a divinity and particularly as a human being --unless we count as a divinity's coming the person of a king or ruler, which is in reality an hypostatisation or a simple representation.<sup>14</sup>

2. Israel did not adopt the concept of God coming to men from its neighbors, as Jörg Jeremias demonstrated in his monograph Theophanie (esp. p.151-164). Israel was marked by a key event: the Sinai theophany. In fact, the Sinai tradition, which marked Israel's conception of God's relation to man, indicates the oldest and first appearance of Yahweh. Thus, the Sinai tradition lies at the basis of the conception of the covenant and subsequent interventions of God. Yahweh, faithful to his covenant, is seen as coming to help his people, and since Exilic times his coming in a more concrete fashion to bring salvation is expected and hoped for. It is therefore not surprising to find a number of references to God's coming in the past and the hope of more in the future. This line of thought was kept alive in the Pseudepigraphic literature and within the Qumran community, as well as in post-Biblical times. It is therefore not impossible that ἦλθον might be the expression, in one word, of the awareness that Jesus is the REALization of the hoped for coming of a Savior. That this could be so is further suggested by the titular use of the unique ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Ps.118,26) in several NT passages (cf. p. 288-300). It is also suggested in the Baptist's query whether Jesus is the ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Mt.11,3/Lk.7,19.20),

<sup>14</sup>On this see esp. the studies of A.D.Nock, "Notes on Ruler-Cult I-IV," in JHS 48(1928), 21-43; "Ruler Worship and Syncretism," in Amer.Jour.Philology 63(1942), 217-223, as well as H.Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, Chicago 1948.



meaning "the Messiah".

It is not to be forgotten that the religious conceptions and faith of Israel were marked by its very particular and personal historical experiences, and vice versa. This is evident in its development of a Messianic expectation. A key concept within Judaism is that of revelation, of God's salvific initiative and absolute lordship over time and space, as well as the consciousness of God's salvific (and at times exclusive!) will for his people. These elements, which substantially remained unchanged, account for the certainty that a savior/Messiah would be sent by God or that God himself would COME --either personally or through an envoy.

"I have come" has been found especially in the mouth of envoys who, through this expression, invested their presence with special importance. Their presence and mission, generally a message to transmit, is given an added seal of authority even if they are only intermediaries who carry out a mission entrusted to them. They are invested with authority by the one who sends, and they reflect this authority when they say "I have come to...." Finally, all these personages who say "I have come to..." come from and are close to a superior being who, in a religious realm, generally is God.

3. It is interesting to observe that, in contrast with the OT, Rabbinic literature almost does not speak of the "coming" of the Messiah. Among the Rabbinic literature, we found  $\text{לָבוֹא} + \text{inf}$  being used idiomatically to express a purpose, intention, or a function, task. This led us to assume that  $\text{ῆλθον} + \text{inf.}$  in our logia, is a Greek rendering of a Palestinian idiomatic expression, and lends at one support to our contention that at their origin our logia expressed Jesus' intentionality, the verb "to come" having served to constitute the idiom "my purpose/intention is to ...."

While the expression "I have come to..." is a Palestinian idiom, it was soon interpreted in the light of the messianic expectation. It was in this light that some of our logia came into being, and the verb "to come" acquired a significance it did not originally have.

## C H A P T E R     S I X

### FURTHER CHRISTOLOGICALLY-ORIENTED USES OF ΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ

In this chapter we shall thematically bring together the remaining significant uses of ἐρχεσθαι as well as of closely related verbs. This analysis may shed further light on the uses of ἡλθον in the logia we have just analyzed. However, not being the central object of our study, our considerations will be, in contrast with the previous chapters, very sketchy: it is only a general survey. I am omitting all references to the future coming (Parousia) of the Lord.

#### A. The Expression "Ὁ Ἐρχόμενος".

The most revealing usage of the verb ἐρχεσθαι in connection with the historical Jesus is that of the absolute ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Used as a titular substantive, as a sort of terminus technicus, it encompasses the Messianic expectations of Judaism and the Christians' realization of its accomplishment. It is found on the lips of the Baptist, of the crowds near Jerusalem, and of believers alike. When Jesus is called the "ὁ ἐρχόμενος" his Messiahship is invoked.

1. The Baptist's announcement of the coming of the Messiah occurs in different terms in our Gospels and Acts:

<u>Mt.3,11b</u>	<u>Mk.1,7</u>	<u>Lk.3,16b</u>	
ὁ (δε) ὀπίσω μου <u>ἐρχόμενος</u> ἰσχυρότερός μου ἔστιν, οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς...	<u>ἔρχεται</u> ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου, οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς...	<u>ἔρχεται</u> (ὁ ἐ) ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς...	
<u>Jn.1,15b</u>	<u>Jn.1,27</u>	<u>Jn.1,30</u>	<u>Acts 13,25b</u>
ὁ ὀπίσω μου <u>ἐρχόμενος</u> ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, (ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.)	ὁ ὀπίσω μου <u>ἐρχόμενος</u> , οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἄξιος...	ὀπίσω μου <u>ἔρχεται</u> ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, (ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.)	ἰδοὺ, <u>ἔρχεται</u> μετ' ἐμέ οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἄξιος...

It should be noted that the original logion spoke only of the two baptisms: John's and Jesus'. The term (ὁ) ἰσχυρότερος is a later addition: it is absent in Jn and Acts, and its addition led to the introduction of the verb ἐστίν in Mt. The reference to Jesus as ἰσχυρότερος implies a comparison (of superiority) with the Baptist whereby Jesus is considered to be "stronger"; it echoes Is.40,10a: "Here is the Lord God coming (ἔρχεται) in might, coming to rule with his right arm." The superiority lies in the power he had as judge. This is evident from the verse which follows (absent in Mk and Jn), which echoes Is.40,10a as well as Mal.3,2f, another important announcement of the coming of the one who will purify with fire. In Lk.11,22 (diff. Mt.12,29/Mk.3,27) we find the same comparison, wherein Jesus alludes to himself as defeater of Beelzebub (cf. also 1 Cor.10,22).

Observing the seven texts above displayed it becomes evident that only the Syn speak of Jesus as ἰσχυρότερος; of these Mk and Lk are similar (ἐρχεται); Jn.1,15b/1,30 and Jn.1,27/Acts are dissimilar. Which of all these is closer to the earliest form? In Acts μετ'ἐμέ removes the ambiguity of ὀπίσω μου (temporal or figurative local?). The expression ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος in Jn.1,15b and 1,27 is probably taken over from Mt; Jn.1,30 plays on Jesus' primacy (ὀπίσω - ἔμπροσθεν - περὶ), and hence is the latest of these four. From the three Syn versions, Lk has preserved the oldest: (1) ὀπίσω μου is absent, and one may wonder why he would have omitted it if it had been in his source (he could always have changed it to μετ'ἐμέ, as in Acts 13,25b!); (2) Mt has taken over ὀπίσω μου from his Mkan source, now placed in a better position; and (3) he also exerted two further transformations, viz. the change from ἐρχεται to ὁ (ὁ) ἐρχόμενος and the shift of the accent from the coming of the Messiah to his quality of ἰσχυρότερος. Thus, since ἰσχυρότερος and ὀπίσω μου were primitively absent, the oldest form probably read something like: ἐρχεται οὗ οὐκ εἰπὶ ἄξιος/ἱκανός ..., i.e. that preserved by Lk and Acts. The text of Acts echoes Mal.3,1f (cf. infra). Even if here we seem to find a tendency to turn to the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος, it should be noted that here it is not used as a Messianic title, but a

qualification: the article is pronominal and ἐρχόμενος has a purely verbal function; the expression is not interchangeable with any known title. That this is so is indicated by Jn.1, 15b/1,30 where it is put side by side with γέγονεν:

ὁ ἐρχόμενος / ὀπίσω μου :: γέγονεν / ἔμπροσθέν μου

2. In Mt.11,3/Lk.7,19(.20c) the imprisoned John sends some of his disciples in order to ask Jesus:<sup>1</sup>

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον / ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

Given the deliberative προσδοκῶμεν and Jesus' reply which alludes to Isa.35,5f; 42,18 and 61,1, as well as the reference to the ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Mt.11,2), it is evident that ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a circumloquium for "the Messiah", with which it is interchangeable. In the Baptist's question, ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used as an absolute having a substantival function which is underlined by the definite article and the absence of any further qualifier. It has, as in the previous text, a futuristic sense: it asks about the expected one who is to come. Thus, the question posed to Jesus is used in a titular fashion in so far as "the Messiah" can be considered as a title and ὁ ἐρχόμενος is here a circumloquium for it. Are Jesus and ὁ ἐρχόμενος (=the Messiah) equivalent? i.e. can Jesus be called "ὁ ἐρχόμενος"? The ἕτερον / ἄλλον in the question posed by John, which contrasts emphatically with σὺ, implies that other ὁ ἐρχόμενος-pretenders had appeared before and therefore JnB is asking whether Jesus is the ὁ ἐρχόμενος, i.e. the true Messiah.

3. During Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem the people accompanying him shout, citing Ps.118(117),26:

<u>Mt.21,9</u>	<u>Mk.11,10</u>	<u>Lk.19,38</u>	<u>Jn.12,13</u>
ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυὶδ, ὡσαννά·	ὡσαννά·	ὡσαννά·	ὡσαννά·
εὐλογημένος	εὐλογημένος	εὐλογημένος	εὐλογημένος
ὁ ἐρχόμενος	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	ὁ ἐρχόμενος	ὁ ἐρχόμενος
		ὁ βασιλεὺς	
ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου,	ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου	ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου	ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου,
...	εὐλογημένη	...	καὶ
	ἡ ἐρχομένη		
	βασιλεία		ὁ βασιλεὺς
	τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν		τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.
	Δαυίδ· ...		

<sup>1</sup>See the study by J. Dupont, "L'ambassade de Jean-Bap- ///

The additions made by the Evangelists to Ps.118 in the above synopsis have been underlined. These are quite revealing. Originally only the Hallel Ps (i.e. without the above additions) was sung, as was customary for the pilgrim(s) coming to Jerusalem at the feast of Tents (Sukkot). It is unmessianic. From this simple fact Jesus' entrance to Jerusalem was developed by tradition into a "triumphant entrance" and accordingly Ps.118 was given a Messianic tone.<sup>2</sup> Indicative of this transformation is the reference to Zech.9,9 by Mt in v.5 and by Jn in v.15: ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται κτλ. The transformation of Ps.118,26 into a shout of a (royal) Messianic import is evident by the various additions made to this citation. In Mt τῷ υἱῷ Δαυὶδ has been added, well in accord with the main stress of this Gospel where "son of David" is the most important title applied to Jesus (cf. already 1,1!): it is a Mtan addition.<sup>3</sup> The Mkan addition is unjewish and springs from the religious-political outlook of the nearness of the Messianic eschatological times: the Davidic (messianic) kingship would be restored. Mk's addition is understandable if the implication intended is that Jesus is David's son, where the Kingdom of David = messianic Kingdom promised to the descendant of David. The parallelism in Mk, between the two εὐλογημένος acclamations establishes an identity between the ἐρχομένη βασιλεία and the ἐρχόμενος: with the ἐρχόμενος comes the βασιλεία. Luke has omitted the ὡσαννά, as he does with other Hebr./Aram. expressions, in view of his Gentile-Christian

---

/// tiste", NRT 83(1961), 805-821 (and 943-959), as well as M. Brunec, "De Legatione Ioannis Baptistae", VD 35(1957), 1 193-203, and M. Völkel, "Anmerkungen zur lukanische Fassung der Täuferanfrage Lk.7,18-23", in Theokratia (FS K.H. Rengstorff), Jahrbuch des Institutum Delitzschianum II(1970-72), 166-173.

<sup>2</sup>See E. Lohse, "Hosianna," NovT 6(1963), 113-119; H. Patsch, "Der Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem," ZTK 68(1971), 1-26, esp.15ff. See further H.-W. Kuhn, "Das Reittier Jesu in der Einzugsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums," ZNW 50(1959), 82-91, P. Zarella, "L'entrata di Gesu in Gerusalemme nella redazione di Matteo," in La distruzione de Gerusalemme des 70, Assisi 1971, 111-133, and W. Trilling, "Der Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem," in Neutestamentliche Studien (FS J. Schmid), Regensburg 1963, 303-309.

<sup>3</sup>See esp. C. Burger, Jesus als Davidsohn, Göttingen 1970, 72-106 (esp.81-87).

audience.<sup>4</sup> The addition of ὁ βασιλεύς, a title serving an epexegetic function alongside ὁ ἐρχόμενος, probably introduced under the influence of Zech.9,9,<sup>5</sup> turns the entrance procession into a royal enthronization. This reflection was already put forward in Lk.1,32f and 23,2f.37. Finally, the addition found in Jn, similar in perspective to that of Lk, is certainly an anticipation of the reference to Zech.9,9 in v.15, and finds an echo in 6,15; 18,37 and 19,19b.21.

As we have already pointed out, originally the citation from Ps.118 was unmessianic. However, early tradition --as evidenced by the present contexts and the additions made-- has given it an unmistakable Messianic tone so that the ὁ ἐρχόμενος is not just the pilgrim entering Jerusalem but now is "the son of David", "the King". Nevertheless, ὁ ἐρχόμενος does not have the value of a title since it is not used as an absolute but is qualified by ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου from which it is inseparable; the exception may be Lk's version; the interposition of ὁ βασιλεύς (which makes ὁ ἐρχόμενος par. to ὁ βασιλεύς) absolutizes ὁ ἐρχόμενος, but the original text is difficult to determine with certainty from the different MS readings.<sup>6</sup>

If Ps.118 was indeed interpreted messianically, then ὁ ἐρχόμενος would be a variation for ὁ Χριστός, i.e. the Messiah. Even though ὁ ἐρχόμενος is not in se a Messianic title, that seems to have been the early Church's interpretation when it applied this Ps to Jesus. We find Ps.118 used in the NT in a Messianic sense applied to Jesus in Mk.8,31; 12,10f; Lk.17,25; 20,17/Acts 4,11/1 Pt.2,4.7; Jn.10,9; besides Mt.23,39/Lk.13,35 (cf. *infra*). To come ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is equivalent to "sent by God" and implies an "ambassadorial mission" like that of

<sup>4</sup>Cf. H.J. Cadbury, *Style* 156. Lk never uses the title "son of David" except when it constitutes the core of a discourse and is already found in his source: 18,38.39; 20,41 and Mk. par.

<sup>5</sup>J. Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah" 59, suggests a probable influence of the Tg to Gen.49,10 (cf. *infra*).

<sup>6</sup>A number of MSS have different readings. Thus  $\mathfrak{X}^*$ , ite, l as well as Origen omit ὁ βασιλεύς;  $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{cor}}$ , A,  $\Theta$ , the Koine, Lake, and Ferrar groups, itaur, f, q, vg, syr<sup>h</sup>, sa, bo, arm, read ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεύς, and D, W omit ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Zahn, *Lk* 632 n.31, understands ὁ ἐρχόμενος as having titular force in Lk's text on the grounds that the use of two separate definite articles distinguish ἐρχόμενος and βασιλεύς.

the prophets, as in 1 Sam.17,45, wherein David tells Goliath "I have come against you in the name of the Lord of Hosts (יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת / ἑν ὀνόματι κυρίου σαβαώθ)"; cf. Jn.5,43; 14,26; Mk. 13,6 par.; Acts 9,28.

It is not without interest to note that Gen.49,10, which in the early Church as well as in Judaism was interpreted messianically, speaks of one coming and obtaining universal rule:

The scepter will not depart from Judah... until שִׁילָה  
comes and unto him shall gather all people;

and v.11 refers to a foal and a colt tied to a vine. We find the following interpretations of the puzzling שִׁילָה:

-Tg Onkelos: עַד דִּי־תִי מְשִׁיחָא דְדִלָּה הִיא מְלִכּוּתָא

-Tg Ps.-Jonathan  
(= in Neofiti I) : עַד זְמַן דִּי יִתִּי מְלִכָא מְשִׁיחָא וְעִיר בְּנוּי :

i.e. שִׁילָה has been messianically interpreted!<sup>7</sup> 4QPatr.Bl.I,3 referred to Gen.49,10 and freely adapted it to read עַד זְמַן מְשִׁיחָא בְּנוּי הַצֶּדֶק, which was interpreted as being David's seed (I,2).<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, it is highly probable that the prophecy of Ezek.21, 32 alludes to Gen.49,10 as many scholars admit.<sup>9</sup> Justin, Apol. 32,6 and Dial. 52-54, Irenaeus, Adv.Haer. iv,10.2, and Cyprian, Test.Iud. 1,21, use Gen.49,10 with respect to Jesus' messiahship; see further Hebr.7,14a; Apoc.5,5 as well as bBer.56b. 57a; Gen.R.98. After all this evidence, one may wonder whether Gen.49,10 suggested the references to Jesus as βασιλεύς in Lk and Jn,<sup>10</sup> since שִׁילָה was thought to be the ideal king, and Jesus' entrance to Jerusalem was interpreted as a messianic and royal enthronization. It seems that there is an interplay between Zech.9,9 and Gen.49,10. With J. Blenkinsopp it can be said that the designation of Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος "understands it as referring to the bringer of messianic fulfillment and the setting up of the messianic kingdom in the new-born Zion."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup>On the whole see esp. W.L. Moran, "Gen 49,10 and its use in Ez 21,32," Bib 39(1958), 405-416, and J. Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah," JBL 80(1961), 55-64.

<sup>8</sup>Text: J.M. Allegro, in JBL 1956, 174f.

<sup>9</sup>See esp. W.L. Moran, art.cit., 416f.

<sup>10</sup>Thus J. Blenkinsopp, art.cit., 59.

<sup>11</sup>Art.cit., 58

4. In Mt.23,39/Lk.13,35 we encounter once more the citation from Ps.118,26. However, the implications are different in both Gospels given the different place therein. In Mt it precedes the prediction of the destruction of the Temple, and the citation of Ps.118,26 forms inclusio for Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup> The Triumphant Entry already having taken place, the phrase οὐ μὴ με ἴδῃτε ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως ἂν εἴπητε· Εὐλογημένος κτλ. can only have an eschatological meaning and very probably refers to his Second Coming:<sup>13</sup> "you shall never see me until the time when you say Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου", i.e. until they greet him as Messiah! Addressed to the Jews it was equivalent to saying that the Lord would be absent with his Shekinah (ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν! cf. Jer.22,5; 1 Kgs.9,7ff.). In Lk this passage precedes the Triumphant Entry and therefore here it probably means (anticipatorily) until that moment (ἕως ἡξεί)<sup>14</sup> when they greet him as Messiah. However, whether Lk. 13,35 looks forward to the Triumphant Entry and refers to it is an open question --while 13,35 is addressed to the Jews, surprisingly only Lk says that those acclaiming Jesus, in 19, 37b, were ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν. From this latter phrase, one is not unjustified in proposing that Lk.13,35 has an eschatological perspective. In any event, the reference to Ps. 118,26 here is definitely a Messianic application, and ὁ ἐρχόμενος has the same non-titular import as it did in Mt.21,9 par. As in all the previous passages where ὁ ἐρχόμενος was used, this expression points to the human appearance on earth of the Messiah.

5. After the feeding of the five thousand, the amazed crowd, in Jn.6,14b said: οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Here we have two adjectives applied to Jesus: he is ὁ προφήτης, which is a reference to the promise of a prophet, similar to Moses' in Dt.18,15.18, and ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν

<sup>12</sup>Boismard, Synopse 359.

<sup>13</sup>Ἀπ' ἄρτι is temporal, "from now on", as in Mt.26,29.64, but ἕως ἂν may be temporal or conditional as H. van der Kwaak, NovT 1966, 169f + n.3, suggests, i.e. there would be a condition imposed for seeing Jesus again, and the logion would be a call to conversion.

<sup>14</sup>ἡξεί ὅτε is omitted by P<sup>45,75</sup>, N, B, syr<sup>p</sup>, sa, bo, arm, geo, Lake group, and ἡμέρα has been added after ἡξεί by itab<sup>i</sup>, syr<sup>ch</sup>



κόσμον. We find the same juxtaposition of qualifiers in Jn. 11,27 where Martha confesses: σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος. Both have their origin in the final stages of composition of the Gospel of John. In none of the two is ὁ ἐρχόμενος ( ) simply a reference to Jesus' appearance in the world, for which the anarthrous participle ἐρχόμενον is used, as in 1,9 (τὸ φῶς) ἐρχόμενον...). The substantivized form (with article) alongside other title(s) suggests that these are interchangeable. It should be borne in mind that the expression εἰς τὸν κόσμον, which is so frequent in Jn is a reaction against docetist tendencies. As indicated by the ὁ Χριστὸς of 11,27, ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a messianic designation which I would dare classify as a Hoheitstitle, as are ὁ προφήτης, and especially ὁ Χριστὸς and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. The nuance of royalty is introduced by the observation in v.15 that the crowds wanted to make him king.

In Jn.3,31 ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used unpretentiously and refers to Jesus' divine origin --it is not interchangeable with any title.

ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· ...

ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος [ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν·]

6. From all the Epistles the only one having the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος, applied to the Lord, is that to the Hebrews. In 10,37b the author cites Hab.2,3b:

ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονίσει.

The citation is taken from the LXX, with minor changes. However, an important difference between the text of Habakkuk and that of Hebrews is that the latter has added the definite article to ἐρχόμενος, thus referring it to the Lord. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is unquestionably thinking of the nearness of the Second Coming: the ὁ ἐρχόμενος not only will not (οὐ) χρονίσει but he will ἥξει --a term used primarily in an epiphanic sense. There is not doubt that ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used as a terminus technicus for Our Lord Jesus Christ, with which it is interchangeable, i.e. it is used in titular fashion.

7. In the Apocalypse 1,4a the greeting runs thus:

Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις...: Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη  
ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἦν καὶ τοῦ ἐρχομένου.

and in 1,8 we find the following revelation:

Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὠ, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός,  
ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ.

while in 4,8b the angels are said to unceasingly sing:

Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ,  
ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

The fact that in 1,4a the nominative is used after the preposition ἀπό indicates that the author considers the triple qualifier to be an undeclinable divine name. In 4,8b the order is changed to a chronological one. A third observation is that ὁ ἐρχόμενος apparently constituted an appellative different from ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν not referring to God's essence since it is absent in 11,17 and 16,5. The expression ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν, which refers to God's being, is probably an adaptation of the revelation of the Tetragrammaton in Ex.3,14 (cf. also Dt.32,39a and Isa.41,4), used in a liturgical context (4,8; 11,17; 16,5 are hymns). After having studied formulas in Greek, Hellenistic and Jewish sources, M. McNamara concluded that

It appears that ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος of the Apocalypse is a servile rendering of the Aramaic ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ (ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ) and is perfectly paralleled in TJI Dt.32,39

and the ἐρχόμενος "is probably either a Christian addition or a Christian adaptation" given that ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ in TJI corresponds to ἐσόμενος and not ἐρχόμενος, even if we must reckon with the fact that in TJI Dt.32,39 there is a reference to God's "coming" to save his people from Gog.<sup>15</sup>

The fact that ὁ ἐρχόμενος is absent in 11,17 and 16,5 -- an omission understandable inasmuch as here God's revelation is definitely completed and the Kingdom fully established-- and that it refers to God's revelation/coming and not to his being, suggests a Christian terminus technicus to designate the aspect of divine revelation. Joined to the expression that designates God's being by the conjunction καί--in contrast with the absence of a connective when ὁ παντοκράτωρ is

<sup>15</sup>M. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, Rome 1966, 97-112 (112).

included, in 1,8 and 4,8-- implies that ὁ ἐρχόμενος was not considered as a title in itself. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος, in the light of the uses of ἔρχεσθαι in the Apoc. (cf. 1,7; 2,5.16; 3,11; 6,1.3.5.7; 16,15; 19,7; 22,7.12.17.20), reveals the Christian's expectation of the nearness of the Parousia.<sup>16</sup>

Let us summarize and appraise the uses of ὁ ἐρχόμενος in the NT. The study of the uses of ὁ ἐρχόμενος suggests the following criteria for determining whether it has a titular connotation: (1) the expression must be used as a substantive, i.e. the article must not have a pronominal function nor the participle a verbal one, and (2) it must be interchangeable with another title, especially that of "the Messiah". With these criteria, and after briefly analyzing the sayings wherein it occurs, we have found it used in a titular fashion in Mt.11,3/Lk.7,19(.20), and Hebr.10,37; it is somewhat doubtful in Lk.19,38 and in the two uses in Jn (viz. 6,14 and 11,27) on account of εἰς τὸν κόσμον (which very probably was an anti-docetist addition). In these passages ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a circumloquium for "the Messiah" and has a titular value as far as it may be interchangeable with the latter. However, it is not a title in the strict sense of the word.

In all the passages analyzed, except those that look forward to the Second Coming, ὁ ἐρχόμενος is an appellative that (1) corresponds to Jesus' real appearance on earth (as Jn stresses); (2) refers to God's promise that one sent as savior (and judge) would come; and (3) by its very nature indicates an ambassadorial mission from God to men.

Ὁ ἐρχόμενος, used by John the Baptist, especially in Mt. 11,3/Lk.7,19, without any further qualification, suggests that it was an expression known among (at least a certain sector of) Jews as referring to the Messiah, even if actual evi-

<sup>16</sup> See J.M. Ford, "'He that Cometh' and the Divine Name," JSJ 1(1970), 144-147, who suggests that the origin of ὁ ἐρχόμενος is to be sought in the author of the Apoc. himself, not in Judaism (145), and that "the writer or redactor of the Apocalypse saw a divine aspect of the Son of Man and the Lamb, seeing in them 'He That Cometh' and in order to convey this theological point he introduced the title into the divine Name." (147). The juxtaposition of ὁ ἐρχόμενος with the Tetragrammaton is probably a Christian adaptation.

dence of such a usage is almost totally lacking. In the OT it occurs only in Ps.118,26 which in later times acquired a messianic significance, as the Midrash and Targum to it reveal.<sup>17</sup> However, texts like Gen.49,10; Dan.7,13; Mal.3,1f and Zech.2,14; 9,9; 14,5b, among others, could have given occasion to this expression. Possibly ὁ ἐρχόμενος is an expression resulting from the confluence of the Messianic hopes and the apocalyptic imagery which painted the figure of the revealer and judge-savior coming from heaven. The most notable of these images is that of the "son of man" in Daniel and 1 Enoch.

The expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος has as backdrop the apocalyptic-prophetic conception of God's EPIPHANY as judge and savior. The ὁ ἐρχόμενος is the revealer and executor of God's just designs. It is noteworthy that we find these and other aspects in the figure of the "(one like a) son of man" and in the surrounding contexts of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος references. Both, "son of man" and "he that comes" are veiled terms, a circumloquium for a heavenly personage who is surrounded by an air of majesty and triumph, and who is the Endzeit revealer of "God's secrets" and eschatological judge. Much has been written about the messianic character of the apocalyptic figure of the "son of man", but one particularly revealing passage has often been neglected: the Targum to Ps.80,16b.18b (a doublet):  
v.16b: MT : לְבָנ־אָדָם יֵצֵא בֵּן-אָדָם (בֶּן-אָדָם) v.18b: MT : לְבָנ־אָדָם יֵצֵא בֵּן-אָדָם  
LXX: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους LXX: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους  
Tg : לְבָנ־אָדָם יֵצֵא בֵּן-אָדָם Tg : לְבָנ־אָדָם יֵצֵא בֵּן-אָדָם

Some of the texts we have cited echo Mal.3,1f, thus:

Acts 13,24f

Mal.3,1f

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| 24a. ... πρὸ προσώπου     | 1a. ἐπιβλέψεται ὁ δὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου |
| τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ...      | 2a. τίς ὑπομένει ἡμέραν εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ; |
| 25b. ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται... | 1b. ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται, λέγει κύριος ....    |

The parallels to Acts read either ἔρχεται (Mk.1,7/Lk.3,16b/Jn. 1,30) or ὁ (ὁπίσω μου) ἐρχόμενος (Mt.3,11b/Jn.1,27/Jn.1,15b). We already indicated that the oldest form was most probably preserved by Lk and Acts.

<sup>17</sup>For the OT understanding of this Ps. see esp. H. Kraus, Psalmen II, Neukirchen 1960, 802ff. See further Billerbeck I, 845-9 and J. Jeremias, Abendmahlswoorte, 247-251.

The logion of Mt.11,3/Lk.7,19 is probably also related to the prophecy of Mal. In Mt.11,10/Lk.7,27 the prophecy of Mal. 3,1a is applied to JnB: ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου. The Messiah is designated as ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which may be a titular adaptation of Malachi's ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται (3,1b), the Baptist being the one "sent" by God as forerunner (Mal.3, 1a). Are not these relations intentionally falling back on Mal.3,1?

One may further wonder whether in Apoc.1,8 and 4,8 the close connection between the titles ὁ ἐρχόμενος and παντοκράτωρ finally echo Mal.3,1b (ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ); note that in 11,17a we have the same qualifiers as in 1,8 and 4,8, except ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Does this indicate, once more, that Malachi's ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται, which was a prediction, has been transformed into a titular ὁ ἐρχόμενος given its accomplishment?

These observations suggest that Mal.3,1 may have been at the very root of, or at least one of the major inspirations for, the use of the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος applied to Jesus Christ. While in the prophecy itself it is not clear to whom ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται refers, if to Malachi, another messenger, or to Yahweh himself, it seems that at least the early Church understood it to refer to the Messiah (cf. Acts 13,25 and Apoc.), and reserved the first part of the prophecy (ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου) for JnB.

From the observations we have made it would follow that we have to deal with an expression that has its background and original "setting in life" in a Palestinian milieu, but whether its origin is to be found in Judaism or in the Christian reflection on Jesus' messiahship remains an open question. In any event, it does not originate from the Greco-Hellenistic world. It is not found once in any of the Epistles that originated there, but occurs in those writings that were composed on the basis of Jewish-Christian traditions. In fact, ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used in a context that is imbued with a Jewish background: the citation of Ps.118,26 in Mt.21,9;23,39 par., that of Hab.2,3 in Hebr.10,37, the reference to Jesus as new Moses in Jn.6,14, the liturgical hymn to the Creator in Apoc.4,8.

Whether it was an expression current among and "borrowed" from the Baptist's group is impossible to determine.<sup>18</sup>

If ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a terminus technicus for the Messiah, used in the NT to point to the actualization of God's promise of a savior and final revealer of his designs for men, then it is highly probable that behind the ἦλθον-form of speech the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος is present. In other words, ἦλθον would be a self-revelatory affirmation of the presence of the Messiah; the ἦλθον-sayings would be concrete statements of messiahship in the mouth of the ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

#### B. Further Significant Uses of ἔρχεσθαι in the Synoptic Gpls.

Besides the sayings which we have studied in c.IV and V, the verb ἔρχεσθαι is also found in a number of passages wherein its use is not casual but rather has a certain Christological significance.

1. ἔρχεσθαι in Miracle Stories. On two occasions there is question of Jesus coming to perform a miracle. Mt indicates that, to the Centurion's request to have his servant cured, Jesus replied:

ἐγὼ ἔλθων θεράπεύσω αὐτόν (8,7; diff. Lk.7,6; Jn.4,48).

So significant is this saying that it develops into a discourse on the part of the Centurion about his unworthiness to receive Jesus, which ends in a statement by Jesus about the greatness of the petitioner's faith. This story contrasts with the cure of Naaman (2 Kgs.5,1-14, cf. v.11) and Elijah's resurrection of the son of the widow of Zarephtha (1 Kgs.17,17-24, cf. esp. v.18b).

Jairus asks Jesus to raise his daughter who has just died: ἔλθων ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν καὶ ζήσεται.

(Mt.9,18b/Mk.5,23b; v. absent in Lk). Jesus grants this re-

<sup>18</sup>For Kümmel, Promise 110, ὁ ἐρχόμενος "was by no means a customary designation in the early Church nor a current Jewish one, and a Christian formulation would surely much more readily have employed current terminology." For Hoffmann, Logienquelle 199f, ὁ ἐρχόμενος was a Q title, having less to do with Ps.118 than with Dan.7,13, and could have originated in John the Baptist. According to J.M. Ford, "He that Cometh" 145, the Evangelists "have interpreted 'He That Cometh' as the (a) Messianic title (!)."

quest. Similarly, Jesus ἔρχεται to the tomb of Lazarus to raise him (Jn.11,38) after the sisters had told him that their brother would not have died had he been there (v.21.32). At Naim Jesus προσελθὼν raises the widow's son (Lk.7,14). A dead person remains dead unless Jesus comes to give him life!

2. ἔρχεσθαι in Parabolic Speech. One may wonder whether there is any significance attached to the verb ἔρχεσθαι in the puzzling construction of the metaphor in Mk.4,21 (diff. Mt.5, 15/Lk.8,16):<sup>19</sup>

μήτι ἔρχεται<sup>20</sup> ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ  
ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην;

That it is significant and that it refers either to Jesus himself<sup>21</sup> or more probably, to his teaching,<sup>22</sup> where the teacher and the teaching are identified and hypostatised, is suggested by the explanation that follows wherein ἔρχεσθαι is used (again, only in Mk):

οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν (v.22).

Furthermore, in Mk and Lk this saying follows the Parable of the sower wherein it is said that the sower (Jesus) ἐξηλθεν (Mk. 4,3/Mt.13,3/Lk.8,5) to sow.

<sup>19</sup>Mk has preserved the oldest form: it is highly Semitizing, as indicated by the double question, the use of the article with nouns that remain indeterminate, and ἔρχεσθαι with an inanimate object. See J. Jeremias, "Die Lampe unter dem Scheffel," ZNW 39(1940), 237-240 as well as Boismard, Synopse 133. Being the lectio difficilior, ἔρχεται is older than the smoothed καίουσιν of Mt and ἄψας of Lk. The Gospel of Thomas, 33b, has the following reading: "For no one lights a lamp (and) puts it under a bushel, nor ...," which echoes Lk's version.

<sup>20</sup>D, it read ἀπτεται instead (cf. Mt), and W, sa, the Ferrar group read καίεται (cf. Lk). W.C. Allen, in his art. "The Aramaic Elements in St. Mark," ExpT 13(1901/02), 330, supposed that the use of ἔρχεσθαι here represented a mistranslation of the Aphel or of the Hitafel of שָׁלַח meaning "to bring" or "be brought". However, Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II, 81, pointed to similar uses which are not from a Semitic source: Baruch 3,33 (ὁ ἀποστέλλων τὸ φῶς καὶ πορεύεται) and Heliodor 8,12 (φῶς ἦκει πρὸς ταῖς)

<sup>21</sup>That may have been the most primitive sense, as Grundmann, Mk 96; Lohmeyer, Mk 85; Cranfield, Mk 164f; Schweizer, Mk 55, and Jeremias, art.cit. 240, proposed. For Taylor, Mk 263; Nineham, Mk 141, and Schulz, Q 475 n.559, it refers to the hiddenness of the Kingdom of God. In this case it would be more logical to think that this logion alluded to the Mkan Messianic secret, i.e. as referring to the identity of Jesus.

<sup>22</sup>Thus esp. Schneider, "Das Bildwort von der Lampe," ZNW 62(1970) (183-209), 198. This is supported by v.22. The importance is given not to the lamp in itself but to what it does, as is the case with the parable of the sower --which follows.

In the Parable of the Barren fig tree the verb ἔρχεσθαι plays a key role. The owner ἦλθεν seeking fruit in it (Lk. 13,6b) and found none. He therefore orders his workmen to cut it down because τέτταρα ἔτη (!) ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκω (v.7).

3. The Kingdom of God. With Jesus' coming the Kingdom of God has been inaugurated, but not yet fully established. It is only with an eschatological outlook that there is talk of the coming of the Kingdom. Thus in the Lord's Prayer we are taught to pray: ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου (Mt.6,10/Lk.11,2).<sup>23</sup>

In the triumphal entry to Jerusalem, in Mk, Lk and Jn the crowds shout a reference to Jesus' royalty:

<u>Mk.11,10</u>	<u>Lk.19,38</u>	<u>Jn.12,13</u>
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος	εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος	εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος
ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·	ὁ <u>βασίλευς</u> ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·	ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου,
εὐλογημένη	...	καὶ
<u>ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία</u>		<u>ὁ βασιλεὺς</u>
τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ·		τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
...		

And in Mt.21,5 we find Zech.9,9 cited:

ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι.

The Kingdom proclaimed is the Messianic Kingdom, and it becomes identified with Jesus' own coming (cf. Mk.11,10 above!).

Finally, reference must also be made to the Mkan summary in 1,39, which follows Jesus' affirmation that "to preach ἐξ-ἦλθεν":

καὶ ἦλθεν<sup>24</sup> κηρύττων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων (diff. Lk.4,44).

To conclude, it can be affirmed that ἔρχεσθαι is not always used casually or insignificantly, but at times carries a Christological connotation. This is most evident in the use of the absolute ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

<sup>23</sup>See also the uses of ἔρχεσθαι in Mk.9,1c (diff. Mt.16,28/Lk.9,27); Lk.17,20 and 22,18.

<sup>24</sup>ἦλθεν is doubtful; many trustworthy MSS (D, it, syr) read ἦν instead, as in Lk.4,44. However, ἦλθεν is probably the original for it follows naturally on ἐξἦλθεν, and ἦν can be easily explained as a grammatical improvement to which Lk would be a witness.



### C. The Gospel of John.

1. The ἦλθον-logia in Jn. In the Gospel of John we find twelve logia where ἔρχεσθαι is used in the first person on the lips of Jesus. Of these, six are in the aorist (ἦλθον: 8,14; 9,39; 10,10b; 12,27.47; 15,22) and the remaining six in the perfect (ἐλήλυθα: 5,43; 7,28; 8,42; 12,46; 16,28; 18,37). Five of these are concerned with the question "whence did Jesus come?"

a) ἦλθον + purpose Logia. There are five logia where Jesus refers to the purpose of his coming. In 9,39 the Lord responds to the cured blind man's confession of faith:

εἰς κρίμα ἐχὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται.

And in 12,47b he affirms that

οὐ (γὰρ) ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον.

Both logia have been inserted in the respective discourses by the pre-final redactor. The story of the cure of the man born blind ended in 9,38. The added remark (v.39) about judgment is most striking in this context, but understandable as a spark that lightens the fiery reaction of the Pharisees in v.40 and Jesus' subsequent condemnation of these "blind" leaders. The logion of 12,46f, in a speech structured around the relation Jesus-the Father, is as striking as is the sentence structure and content of these two verses in contrast with the context. We find the topic of judgment on the world also in 3,17, which is from the final stages of composition of our Gospel:

οὐ (γὰρ) ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ (see also 5,22.27.30; 8,15.16).

In the discourse on the Good Shepherd Jesus affirms:

ἐχὼ ἦλθον ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν (10,10b)

which is a logion that belongs to the earlier stages of composition of Jn and echoes Lk.19,10. The theme is nevertheless exclusively Johannine (cf. 3,15.16.36; 5,40; 6,33.40.47; 10,28; 14,6; 20,31).

Jn.9,39; 10,10b and 12,47b are the only ἦλθον-sayings that approach those of the Synoptics. The other two logia with a purpose given, use the perfect tense. Thus in Jn.12,46 the Lord declares:

ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων  
εἰς ἐμέ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ

which should be compared with the Prologue's ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ..., ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον (1,9) and 3,19: τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἡγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκοτὸς ἢ τὸ φῶς, in order to realize that we are dealing with a logion of Johannine origin (cf. also 1,5; 8,12; 9,5.35; 1 Jn.2, 8b). The structure of 12,46 is similar to that of 9,39.

In 18,37 Jesus answers Pilate:

σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι. ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι  
καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον  
ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

The phrase καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, so frequent in Jn (cf. 3,19; 12,46; 16,28 as well as 1,9; 6,14; 9,39; 11,27) and which gives an added Christological dimension to εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι, is due to the pre-final redactor. The structure resembles that of 12,46.

None of these five logia has the same form and thematic content as the ἦλθον-sayings of the Synoptics. Instead of an infinitive we find ἵνα introducing the purpose clause (in the subjunctive). In Jn seldom is a verb of movement used with an infinitive; ἵνα + subjunctive is used instead. Furthermore, the first person is underlined by the very Johannine ἐγὼ (except in 12,47b, but see v.47a!). The aorist and the perfect are interchangeable, as these and other logia show; the aorist has a perfective connotation. Finally, in all (except 10,10b) the coming is in relation to the κόσμος. Not only is their structure different from that of the Synoptic ἦλθον-sayings and stamped with Johannine elements, but also the theme is "typical" of the Gospel of John: to judge the world, to give life, to be a light, to witness to truth.

b) Whence I Came. There are other logia wherein ἐρχεσθαι is used in the first person and which distinguish themselves by their concern with Jesus' origin. In 8,14b Jesus tells the Pharisees:

οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω· ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε  
πόθεν ἔρχομαι ἢ ποῦ ὑπάγω.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup>This is a biblical (semitic) formula equivalent to "who are you?" (cf. 7,28; Gen.16,18; Jg.13,6; 19,17; 1 Sam.25,11...)

And in 7,26b-29 the question of Jesus' origin is sharply posed on the basis of the view that the origin of the Messiah is unknown:

(26b) Can it be that our rulers have actually decided that this is ὁ Χριστός? (27) And yet we know where this man comes from (πόθεν ἐστίν), but when the Messiah (ὁ Χριστός) comes (ἔρχεται) no one is to know where he comes from (πόθεν ἐστίν),

to which Jesus replies:

(28) No doubt you know me; no doubt you know where I come from (πόθεν εἰμί). Yet ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, but the one who sent me (ὁ πέμψας με) is true, and him you do not know. (29) I know him because παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι καὶ κείνός με ἀπέστειλεν.

In this passage the alternation between coming (ἔρχεσθαι) and being sent (πέμπειν - ἀποστέλλειν), which is so frequent in the Gospel of John, comes to the fore. The same question is also treated in 7,31.41f.52 and 9,29ff.

In 8,42 we find a similar affirmation, with a combination of three different verbs:

ἐγὼ (γὰρ) ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξηλθον καὶ ἤκω.  
οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα (cf. 7,28b!)  
ἀλλ' ἐκείνός με ἀπέστειλεν (cf. 7,29b!).

It is to be noted that v.42bc overload the logion and is posterior to v.42a, given the parallelism with 7,28b.29b. The expression (οὐ) ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ is exclusively Johannine (cf. 5,30; 7,17.28; 8,28; 10,18; 14,10). The declaration of 8,42 presents two points of view: an epiphanic one, with ἐξέρχεσθαι and underlined by ἤκω, and a prophetic one, with ἀποστέλλειν/οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα. These two viewpoints are interchangeable in the Gospel of John, which contains a correlation between "coming" and "being sent".

Jesus' origin from the Father is clearly stated in 16,27b.

28a:

ἐγὼ παρὰ Θεοῦ ἐξηλθον. ἐξηλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον (cf. 3,2; 13,3; 16,30; 17,8b).

where it is noted that God and the Father are likewise interchangeable, as is often the case in Jn. Again, in 5,43 Jesus declares:

ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου ....

There remain two ἦλθεν-sayings of disparate content. In 12,27 Jesus speaks in emotional terms of his forthcoming Passion:

Now my soul is in turmoil, and what am I to say? Father, save me from this hour? No, διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον to this hour.

And, in 15,22a we encounter the following affirmation:

εἰ μὴ ἦλθον καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχουσιν.

2. Other Significant Uses of Ἐρχεσθαι in John. Besides the "I have come" sayings we have just considered, ἔρχεσθαι is evidently also used in other than the first person or in the participle when referring to Jesus' coming. Some of these sayings have already been mentioned, viz. 1,9; 3,19 (both related to 12,46), and 7,27.31.41.42 (related to 7,28).

In the Prologue it is said that Jesus εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν (1,11). It is noteworthy that in the Prologue there is no reference to Jesus having been sent but to his having come (v.9c.11a). This is also true in the Baptist's testimony to Jesus who is called by him ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος (1,15b.27a; cf. also 1,30), while the Baptist is primarily one sent by God (v.6a: ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ; v.33a: ὁ πέμψας με).

We find ἔρχεσθαι also used in three different passages of Messianic import. In 3,2a it is said that Nicodemus told Jesus:

Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher that ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας. Before Jesus' self-revelation to the Samaritan woman, the latter informed him:

I know that a Messiah (i.e., Christ), is coming (ἔρχεται).

When he comes (ἔλθῃ) he will tell us everything (4,25).

In 6,14b, after seeing the multiplication of loaves, those present confess:

οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

These last two statements echo Dt.18,15.18, and picture Jesus as the "new Moses". Jn.4,25 is an affirmation of the expectation of the prophet like Moses promised in, what for the Samaritans is the key text, Dt.18,15.18. And Jn.6,14b not only speaks of ὁ προφήτης but in the context of 6,1-14 also pictures Jesus as the "new Moses" --note that the confession is sparked by the σημεῖον (v.14a) which in v.31f (a later redactional moment) is related to the mana.

Finally, it is noteworthy that on four occasions the appearances of the risen Christ are introduced in terms of coming. In his first appearance (20,19) Christ ἦλθεν and stood in the midst of the disciples. However, Thomas was absent ὅτε ἦλθεν

Ἰησοῦς (20,24). A week later, this time Thomas being present, the Lord ἔρχεται even though the doors were closed (20,26). Again, Christ ἔρχεται and eats with the disciples in Galilee (21,13).<sup>26</sup> This use of ἔρχεσθαι for the risen Lord, unique to the Gospel of John, may well have been intended to reaffirm the reality of the Resurrection and the continuity between the earthly Jesus and the risen Christ in the coordinates of history. They bring to mind the ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἦλθον/ἐλήλυθα of 3,2a; 16,27b.28a; etc.

#### D. The Remaining Writings of the New Testament.

In the remaining writings of the NT the verb ἔρχεσθαι, is seldom used in connection with the historical coming of Jesus. It is by far more frequently used when speaking of the Lord's second coming. There are only six instances in which ἔρχεσθαι is used outside of the Gospels to refer to the historical Jesus.

In Gal.2,19 Paul writes:

Then what of the Law? ... It was a temporary measure  
ἄχρῃς οὐ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα to whom the promise was made.

Referring to Isa.57,19 and Zech.9,10 the author of the epistle to the Ephesians wrote,

καὶ ἔλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν ... (2,17).

One of the most concise statements about the purpose of Jesus' coming is that found in 1 Tim.1,15b, the Christological weight of which is remarkable:

Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁματωλοὺς σῶσαι.

To be noted are the Syn (ἦλθεν + inf.) and Johannine (εἰς τὸν κόσμον) traits there combined: is it a synthesis of both?

In 1 Jn.4,2 Christians are put on their guard against docetist tendencies:

This is how we may recognize the Spirit of God: every spirit which acknowledges Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα is from God.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>26</sup>Only 20,19 has a parallel, in Lk.24,36 where there is no question of Christ's coming. In Lk.24,36 Christ suddenly ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν implying "he appeared", as in v.4 with respect to the angels (cf. also v.11 and v.34).

<sup>27</sup>Note the perf. ἐληλυθότα, a tense we have encountered quite often in Jn, and which is characteristic of the pre-final redaction of the latter.

This warning is repeated in 2 Jn.7:

Many deceivers have gone into the world who do not acknowledge Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί.

Concerning the Lord, in 1 Jn.5,6 we find the following affirmation:

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός

a constation we find already in Jn.19,34.

#### E. Apocryphal Writings.

There are several ἡλθον-sayings found in the non-canonical Gospels and which should be pointed out. Clement of Alexandria preserved two ἡλθον-sayings from Gnostic gospels. In Strom. III,9.63 he reports the following logion from the Gospel of the Egyptians:

ἡλθον καταλῦσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας. θηλείας μὲν, τῆς ἐπιθυμίας· ἔργα δὲ, γένεσιν καὶ φθοράν.

which echoes Mt.5,17! In Strom. IV,6 Clement cites the logion of Lk.19,10 as transmitted in the Gospel (or Traditions) of Matthias:

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν σήμερον τὸ ἀπολωλὸς εὔρεν.

Epiphanius quotes from the Gospel of the Ebionites, or Hebrews, in Haer. 30,16, the following logion that is modelled on that of Mt.5,17 and echoes Mt.9,13a (Hos.6,6):

ἡλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσιάς (cf. Ps.-Clem., Hom. 3,51).

In the Gospel of Thomas, logion 16 is the only "I have come" saying therein found:<sup>28</sup>

Jesus said: Men perhaps think that I have come to cast peace upon the world, and they do not know that I have come to cast divisions upon the earth, fire, sword, war. (cf. Mt.10,34/Lk.12,51f!)

In the Gospel of Philip we find the following logia:<sup>28a</sup>

n.54: Er [Jesus] sagte: Ebenso kam [der] Sohn des Menschen, [um] die Fehler [Wegzunehmen]. (cf. n.9, 53 and 67).

n.69: [Der Herr] aber sagte: Ich bin gekommen, um [das Untere] gleich dem Oberen [und das Aussere] gleich dem Inneren zu machen (cf. 2 Clem. xii,2; Act.Phil. 34). [Ich bin gekommen, um] sie in jenem Orte [zu vereinigen ...].

n.78: Hätte die Frau [=Eva, cf. n.79] sich nicht vom Manne

<sup>28</sup>Transl. by B.M. Metzger, in K. Aland, ed. Synopsis.

<sup>28a</sup>Transl. by H.-M. Schenke, "Das Evangelium nach Philip-pus," TLZ 84(1959), col.1-26.

getrennt, wäre sie nicht zusammen mit dem Manne gestorben. Die Trennung von ihm ist zum Anfang des Todes geworden. Deswegen ist Christus gekommen, (nämlich) damit er die Trennung, die von Anfang an bestand, berichtige, damit er denen, die sich mit der Trennung angefüllt hatten, Leben gebe und sie vereinige.

In the Papyrus Egerton 2, one of the earliest fragments we possess of the Gospel of John,<sup>29</sup> we find the following reading of Jn.5,45, nowhere else attested:

κεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἦλθον κατηγο<sup>μὴ δ[ο</sup>ρεῖσθαι  
[ύμῶν] πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου .... (fragm. I, verso 1.10ff).

while the quasi-unanimity of MSS do not have ἦλθον + inf. but simply κατηγορήσω, and do not have the possessive after πατέρα.

The texts we have pointed out witness to the tendency to multiply ἦλθον-sayings. This observation had become clear in our survey of Gnostic literature.

F. Significant Uses of the Verbs Ἐξέρχεται, Ἦκειν, Ἀποστέλλειν and Πέμπειν.

The verbs ἔξέρχεται and ἦκειν are closely related to ἔρχεται, while the verbs of "sending", ἀποστέλλειν and πέμπειν take the point of view of the initiative coming from the sender and suggest an obedience by the one sent. A brief survey of the uses of these verbs in the NT is advisable because it serves to narrow the meaning and implications of ἦλθον.

1. Ἐξέρχεται. This verb bears the particular nuance of coming FROM (ἐξ-), and in fact it is used almost exclusively to refer to Jesus' divine origin. It is found on the lips of Jesus, referring to himself, only in the Gospel of John, and always in the aorist. (On Mk.1,38 see p. 194-209).

In his defense against those wanting to kill him Jesus declares:

ἐγὼ (γὰρ) ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξηλθὼν καὶ ἦκω (8,42)

and that is the explanation given by the final redactor, in 13,3, for Jesus' awareness that his hour had come:

εἰδὼς ὅτι πάντα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας  
καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξηλθεν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει.

<sup>29</sup>See C.H. Dodd, New Testament Studies, Manchester 1953, 12-52, and E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha I, 94-97, among others.

Following the statement by Christ concerning his origin, viz.:

ἐγὼ παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον. ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς  
καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον (16,27c.28a),

the disciples confess:

πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες (16,30b).

And, in the prayer to the Father, referring to his disciples, Christ says:

ἐγνώσαν ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ  
ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας (17,8bc).

The logia in 16,28a and 17,8c are late additions.

The only other two usages of ἐξέρχεσθαι worth mentioning are in Mt.13,3/Mk.4,3/Lk.8,5 (ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων [τοῦ] σπείρειν -- compare with v.1. Cf. also Mt.14,14 and 20,1.3.5.6) and Mk.1,45 (Jesus ἐξεληθὼν --no origin given!-- ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλά. Cf. also Mk.2,13 and 6,12.34).

In Jn ἐξέρχεσθαι, having a nuance different from ἐρχεσθαι, as is evident in 16,28a, is not confused with ἐρχεσθαι, i.e. each is used with a different nuance: the latter expresses an independent personal initiative while ἐξέρχεσθαι denotes a direct relation and dependence on the source of origin: it concentrates on the "whence", as is very clear in 16,28a.<sup>30</sup>

2. Ἥκειν. In the NT ἡκειν is used mostly in reference to the Parousia, having the sense of "to appear": it is a term for epiphany.

In Jn.8,42 it is found alongside ἐξέρχεσθαι:

ἐγὼ (γὰρ) ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω

where the verbal tenses are to be noted. While the aorist ἐξῆλθον refers to the punctual, historical fact, the present ἤκω suggests a continuous epiphanic presence: I came and am present.

In Hebr.10,7.9 ἤκω, referring to Jesus' coming to the world, is taken from Ps.40,7(LXX), to which the author alludes.

The final redactor of 1 Jn writes, before concluding the letter, the following confession:

οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἦκει καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν (5,20a)

<sup>30</sup>The only text wherein ἐρχεσθαι is used referring to Jesus' origin from God is Jn.3,2. However, Nicodemus' statement ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας has a different nuance, strictly meaning "from the part of God" or, as he adds, "ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ."



where the present ἵκει, contrasting with the perfect δέδωκεν, has the same nuance as it had in Jn.8,42, viz. that of a continuous epiphanic presence on the grounds that αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος (5,20d).

3. Ἀποστέλλειν. This verb, as well as πέμπειν, although scarcely found in the Synoptics, is quite frequent in the Gospel of John, mostly referring to the origin of Jesus' mission.

a) In the Synoptics we find three analogous sayings wherein God is called τὸν ἀποστέλλαντά (με):

(i) Mt.10,40

(ii) Mk.9,37 par. Lk.9,48

(iii) Lk.10,16

ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται <u>τὸν ἀποστέλλαντά</u> <u>με.</u>	ὅς ἂν ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξεται [cf. Jn.3,5] ... ἐμὲ δέχεται καὶ ὅς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχεται οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται ἀλλὰ <u>τὸν ἀποστέλλαντά</u> <u>με.</u>	ὅς ἂν δέξεται τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ... ἐμὲ δέχεται καὶ ὅς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξεται δέχεται <u>τὸν ἀποστέλλαντά</u> <u>με.</u>	ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ. ὁ (ὁὲ) ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ <u>τὸν ἀποστέλλαντά</u> <u>με.</u>
---	---	--	--

As it is evident, we have to do with three sayings adapted to three different circumstances, always addressed to the disciples. Of these, Mk's is the closest to the original saying which apparently had an independent existence --it was added to the original pericope (about true greatness). The expression τὸν ἀποστέλλαντα for God is used in reference to Jesus seen as the Endzeit prophet: Mt captured this viewpoint well when in 10,41 he adds ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου κτλ. Similarly, in Mt.15,24, which we shall study in greater detail (cf. p.315 - 319), Jesus answered the Syrophoenician woman:

οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλῶτα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ

(cf. also Mt.10,6). This logion is echoed in the Parable of the vineyard, in Mt.21,37/Mk.12,6/(diff.Lk.20,13: πέμψω), wherein after the lord of the vineyard had sent (ἀποστέλλειν) his servants, he finally sends (ἀπέστειλεν) his son (Mk/Lk: ἀγαπητόν). In both texts Jesus says he has been sent to Israel, and in the Parable of the vineyard there is question of others

having been sent before him, i.e. the prophets. This question indicates that ἀποστέλλειν expressed the viewpoint that Jesus' coming was analogous to that of the prophets God had sent before him to Israel. In the Parable of the vineyard it becomes clear that Jesus is the last of the prophets sent to Israel.

Lk's substitution in 4,43b to his source's ἐξηλθον (Mk.1, 38) is instructive --this pericope was studied in detail already, cf. c. Three, I. As in the previous pericopes, here it is also a question of having been sent to Israel (v.44: καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας). The change was very probably made in order to remove the ambiguity of ἐξηλθον with a univocal term, viz. ἀπεστάλην. The fact that it was not substituted by the simple ἦλθον (or its pft. tense) suggests that ἀποστέλλειν was a term Christologically more refined than either of the other two.

b) Let us turn our attention to the relevant uses of ἀποστέλλειν in the Gospel of John wherein, compared with the Synoptics, it is by far more frequent.

Jn.3,17 is the only logion wherein ἀποστέλλειν is followed by an indication of purpose, with the same structure as the ἦλθον-sayings in Jn:

οὐ (γὰρ) ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον  
ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ

which should be compared with 12,47b:

οὐ (γὰρ) ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον.

Of these, 3,17 is a more developed and later logion than 12, 47b; it is an addition to Jesus' discourse, breaking the flow between v.16 and 18b (note the repetition of ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν in 18a). The logion of 12,47b is also an addition, as is that of 9,39 which at first sight seems to contradict the other two:

εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ  
βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται.

There is no contradiction among any of these for in none is it said that Jesus himself will judge, but rather that judgment takes place because of him. That 3,17 is posterior to the other two is suggested by the fact that a similar manner of speaking is found in 1 Jn.4,9b:

τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς  
εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ

and also in v.14b:

ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου.

The apologetic use of Jesus' miracles in Jn.5,36 and 10,25b contrasts with the less pretentious acknowledgment of Nicodemus in 3,2:

οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται  
ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ

while in 5,36 the dispute with the Baptist's sect is evident:

ἐγὼ (δὲ) ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου· τὰ γὰρ ἔργα  
(ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ...) ἃ ποιῶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ  
(ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν [posterior addition])

and in 10,25b the sense of Jesus' ἔργα is clarified, with the addition to his explanation for the unbelief of the Jews:

τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου [cf.  
5,43] ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.

Of these, the recognition of Jesus as a prophet in 3,2 is older.

In the discourse about the heavenly origin of Jesus we read:

ὃν (γὰρ) ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ (3,34a)

which is a posterior addition to v.31b.d.32.33.35.

We find ἀποστέλλειν in two sayings wherein Christ relates faith in him to faith in the one who sent him. In the addition to the discourse about witnesses to Jesus, in Jn.5,36ff, we encounter the following affirmation:

τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ [the Father's] οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα  
ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε (v.38)

and, in the insertion (6,27-29) made to the discourse about the bread of life we read:

τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον [! =total salvific work] τοῦ θεοῦ  
ἵνα πιστεῦήτε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος (v.29)

There are also a number of sayings where the Lord invokes the Father asking that those who are with him may really believe that He sent him. Thus in the prayer preceding the resurrection of Lazarus

... διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα εἶπον,  
ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας (11,42)

and repeatedly in the farewell prayer in Jn.17:

(6) ἐφανερώσά σου τὸ ὄνομα... ὅτι... (8) ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς  
ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας.

where v.8c, expressing a viewpoint complementary to v.8b, is very probably an addition (note the parallelism between v.7 and v.8b). Likewise, in 17,21.23.25 we find a similar concern in an escalating refrain fashion:

ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας (21b)  
 ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας (23c)  
 οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας (25b)

which is captured in the straightforward statement of v.3:

αὕτη (ὁ) ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σὲ  
 τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

Concerning Jesus' origin we find the following statements that result from controversies with the Jews:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 8,42bc.55a  | 7,28b-29  |
| 42. ἐγὼ (γὰρ) ἐκ θεοῦ ἐξηλθὼν καὶ ἤκω<br>οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα<br>ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν | οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί καὶ<br>ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα,<br>ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς<br>ὁ πέμψας με,<br>ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε·<br>ἐγὼ οἶδα αὐτόν<br>ὅτι παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι<br>καὶ ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν. |
| 55. καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν<br>ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν.  |   |

As is clear from this doublet, which in c.8 has been intentionally split, the phrase ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν was "movable"; it adds a complementary viewpoint to ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα. It is to be noted that 8,52-55 is an insertion that disrupts the discourse on Jesus' existence before Abraham was. On the other hand, in 7,29 καὶ ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν disrupts the older chiasmic structure of 7,28b-29.

In Jn.10,36 Jesus retorts to those who wanted to stone him:

ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγάσεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς  
 λέγετε ὅτι Βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον, Υἱὸς [τοῦ] θεοῦ εἰμι;

Given the unexpected change to the 3d person and the matter being argued, it seems that v.36a is a posterior addition.

Ἀποστέλλειν is also used in two sayings wherein a continuity of the mission began by Jesus on behalf of the Father is established. In the farewell discourse we find the following insertion:

καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον,  
 καὶ γὰρ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον (17,18)

and in 20,21b the risen Lord tells his disciples:

καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατὴρ καὶ γὰρ πέμπω ὑμᾶς.

Finally, in the discourse of the bread of life, where 6,51-58 are a Eucharist-oriented insertion (note the references to flesh, and especially blood, thus far absent, and the Wiederaufnahme of v.50a in v.58a):

καθὼς ἀπέστείλεν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ καὶ γὰρ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα (57a).

The only time when ἀποστέλλειν with respect to Jesus is used by Paul is in Gal.4,4 --and here as a composite:

ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός,...

Other references to God having sent Jesus are found in Acts 3,20.26; 10,36 and 1 Jn.4,10. Before we evaluate the implications of the uses of ἀποστέλλειν we must study with special attention the logion of Mt.15,24.

c) Sent to the house of Israel: Mt.15,24.<sup>31</sup>

The logion of Mt.15,24, οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ, has been classed with the ἦλθον-logia by A. Harnack and R. Bultmann,<sup>32</sup> and certainly deserves special consideration. I have excluded it from the ἦλθον group of logia mainly on account of its form: different verb employed and absence of an infinitive of purpose.

This logion is found only in Matthew. V.23-24 are absent in the Mkan parallel of the story of the Canaanite woman. As is generally recognized, it is not a Mkan omission but a Mtan addition. V.24 had itself a separate (independent?) existence for not only is it absent in Mk but hardly responds to the disciples' request (v.23).<sup>33</sup> It is a doublet with v.26. The logion can be isolated without affecting the flow of the account.<sup>34</sup> An analogous saying is found in Mt.10,6. The introduction of this logion responds to a fixed idea of Mt, which is already discernable in the redactional v.23 and the trans-

<sup>31</sup>A bibliography on the pericope Mt.15,21-28/Mk.7,24-30 can be found in T. Lovison, "La pericopa della Cananea, Mt. 15,21-28," RivB 19(1971/72), 273 (273-305).

<sup>32</sup>"Ich bin gekommen" 4, 20f; ST 153.

<sup>33</sup>Jeremias, Promise 26; Trilling, Wahre Israel 101; Grundmann, Mt 375; Schweizer, Mt 214; Boismard, Synopse 235.

<sup>34</sup>When we abstract from the logion of v.24, the pericope offers a structure similar to that of Mt.20,29-34/Mk.10,46-52. Cf. Klostermann, Mt 135, and Trilling, op.cit. 101 n.16.

cription of v.22 in direct speech.

There is little room for doubt that Mt.10,6 and 15,24 are closely related and have as a background Ezek.34 and Jer.27,6:

<u>Mt.10,6</u>	<u>Mt.15,24</u>	<u>Ezek.34,15a.16a.30b</u>
πορεύεσθε (δὲ) μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα	οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα	ἐγὼ βοσκήσω τὰ πρόβατά μου τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ζητήσω καὶ αὐτοὶ λαὸς μου οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ...
οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.	οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.	

Jer.27,6a(LXX): πρόβατα ἀπολωλότα ἐχενήθη ὁ λαός μου.

Which of the two logia, if any, is older is difficult to determine with certitude. That 15,24 is at least pre-Mtan in origin can be deduced from the fact that it was introduced here by Mt; it previously had a separate existence.<sup>35</sup> The vocabulary of neither is characteristically Mtan.

J. Jeremias has argued for the Semitic character of Mt. 15,24, as a sure indication that it was pronounced by Jesus.<sup>36</sup> However, the use of the passive ἀπεστάλην need not go back to the Aramaic;<sup>37</sup> οὐκ ... εἰ μὴ, which is not rare in the Syn, is not only always preserved by Mt when he finds it in his Mkan source, but is also introduced in 12,24; 14,17 and 16,4 so that one need not argue a fortiori for a Semitism and one can think of a Mattheism.<sup>38</sup> The preposition εἰς, instead of πρὸς, after ἀπεστάλην is not unique to the LXX, nor necessarily a Semitism either.<sup>39</sup> Thus, from the linguistic standpoint it need not have had an Aramaic background.<sup>40</sup> Since linguistic considerations are not decisive we must turn to the role these logia play in their present contexts and the gospel of Mt at large.

Mt.10,5b-6 is not in its original context.<sup>41</sup> Its markedly

<sup>35</sup>Thus also Jeremias, Promise 26 n.2. However, he argues that "elsewhere Matthew always has ἀποστέλλειν πρὸς τινὰ (21.34, 37;23.34;27.18)" but he underestimates 8,31 (cf.also 14,35;20,2).

<sup>36</sup>Op.cit. 26 + n.2, 27.

<sup>37</sup>Thus also H. Schürmann, "Mt 10,5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes," in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (FS J. Schmid), Regensburg 1963, 271 n.8.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. Trilling, Wahre Israel 100.

<sup>39</sup>See Bl-D §207(1), Zerwick, Greek §97f, Moule, Idiom-Book 67f, and Turner, NTGk III, 256.

<sup>40</sup>Similarly Trilling, op.cit. 100, and Schürmann, art.cit. 271 n.8.

<sup>41</sup>Schürmann, art.cit., concludes that it introduced ///

Semitic formulation,<sup>42</sup> its reference to Samaria, and its sharp contrast with the instruction of Mt.28,19,<sup>43</sup> are aspects which contrast with 15,24 and suggest that it is older. The saying of 10,5b-6 can be considered as having been formulated in view of and for a concrete situation, while that of 15,24 is a programmatic saying of greater messianic-nationalistic radicality than 10,5b-6.<sup>44</sup> The logion of 15,24 brings that of 5,18bc to mind and suggests a similar origin. Except for the anarthrous οἴκου Ἰσραήλ, which suggests a Semitic construct-state --οἴκου being epexegetical<sup>45</sup> -- the logion of Mt.15,24 is not necessarily Semitic. This latter logion not only does not spring from a natural context or condition<sup>46</sup> but its preservation and inclusion in its present context is, in contrast with 10,5b-6, not difficult to understand. It fits one of Mt's favorite themes, which W. Trilling has masterfully studied: Das Wahre Israel, Jesus being presented as the promised Messiah sent to but rejected by Israel (note the "son of David" which Mt put on the woman's lips in v.22!).

The radicality of the statement in Mt.15,24 serves to underline the opposition between rejection and acceptance/faith. The verb ἀποστέλλειν brings forth Jesus' Messiahship: he is the end-time prophet sent by God to Israel. As in the story of the cure of the Centurion's servant, it is the aspect of acceptance/faith that is underlined.<sup>47</sup> The whole pericope, thanks to the insertion of the logion of v.24, illustrates the rejection by

/// Lk.10,8-11. See also Boismard, Synopse 163.

<sup>42</sup>Jeremias, Promise 19 n.3-5, 20 + n.2-4.

<sup>43</sup>See esp. Trilling, Wahre Israel 101f.

<sup>44</sup>Trilling, op.cit. 100. On the sense of εἰ μὴ see esp. Beyer, Semitische Syntax I, 102ff.

<sup>45</sup>It is not partitive but refers to all of Israel in its condition of lost (cf. 9,38; 18,12 par.). Thus Jeremias, op.cit. 26 n.3, and after him Walker, Heilsgeschichte 61 n.67. Bonnard, Mt 232, misread Jeremias when he states that he took it as partitive --Bonnard also considers it to be epexegetic.

<sup>46</sup>To pronounce such a statement to a Jewish audience would have sounded natural to them, if not unnecessary. To state it precisely when Jesus went to pagan territory leads one to ask why he went there if he was sent only for "the house of Israel". After all, he cured the Centurion's servant!

<sup>47</sup>This has been studied in detail by H.J. Held, "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten," in G. Bornkamm et al. Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium, Neukirchen 1968, 155-287, esp. 168-171 and 186-189. See also Trilling, op.cit. 104f.

Israel and the acceptance of Christ by the non-Jews (cf. v.28a).

The logion of Mt.15,24 originated in a Judeo-Christian milieu, very probably of Palestine,<sup>48</sup> in a circle similar --if not the same-- as that responsible for 5,18bc, i.e. a conservative group which clung to their old Jewish ways and possibly was opposed to the Gentile mission.<sup>49</sup> The logion is used by Mt not to give support to such an outlook but to correct it, as he did in 5,17ff. The opposition Canaanite<sup>50</sup>-Israelite, which recalls the veterotestamentary antipathy on religious grounds, and the opposition between our logion and the woman's faith --and consequent granting of her request,-- indicate the ultimate reason for Mt's use of this logion here and the lesson he intended.

From the above discussion it follows that the logion of 15,24 is a secondary formation of the older 10,5b-6,<sup>51</sup> which Mt assumed for a precise purpose. It is therefore useless to ask for its authenticity, which often has been argued totally in a vacuum on the basis of its Semitic appearance and especially on the basis of the particularism it indeed describes by itself.<sup>52</sup>

Remains for us to ask for the sense ἀπεστᾶλην has in this

<sup>48</sup>Grundmann, Mt 375; Bultmann, ST 163.

<sup>49</sup>This is Bultmann's opinion, ST 163; however it is rejected by Jeremias, Promise 28.

<sup>50</sup>Mt has Χαναανᾶ in v.22, while Mk describes her as Syro-phenician (of origin) and Greek (by religion) in v.26; Mt's viewpoint is purely religious, not geographical.

<sup>51</sup>This was already indicated by E. von Dobschütz, "Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet," ZNW 27(1928), 339. Thus also Kümmel, Promise 85, Trilling, Wahre Israel 105 (who considers it to be "eigene Bildung des Matthäus", but in p.172 he states that 15,24 is a secondary formation of 10,6!), Boismard, Synopse 163. To the contrary, Grundmann, Mt 375, sees 10,6 developing out of 15,24.

<sup>52</sup>Thus esp. Jeremias, op.cit. 27: "Matthew's only reason for preserving this logion in spite of its repellent implication was that it bore the stamp of the Lord's authority" (underlining mine). But, if it was so "repellent" one may wonder why it was not simply omitted, as surely other logia were, or somehow rephrased, or even couched so as to soften it. Yet, it is Mt's purpose that gives us the key for its preservation, and not its presumed origin in Jesus. Lovison, "Cananea" 296f, follows Jeremias to the letter. Grundmann, Mt 375, considers its origin in Jesus only as "möglich". To the contrary, Bultmann, ST 163, and Trilling, op.cit. 105, consider it to be of ecclesial origin.



logion. It is unquestionably different from that in Jn where the stress is on the not rare "from God" and "to the world"; in Jn it has a definite epiphanic sense.<sup>53</sup> In Mt.15,24 however, ἀπεστάλην expresses Jesus' messiahship, seen from the prophetic angle; he is the eschatological prophet, the final envoy of God (passive aor.!) to Israel. The fact that no specific purpose for the sending is mentioned in this logion leaves the whole weight on this decisive event: the envoy of God was sent to Israel as promised.

Let us evaluate and summarize the considerations to which the chain of ἀποστέλλειν -passages have been leading us. The first observation is that ἀποστέλλειν in respect to the relation Jesus-God is extremely rare in the Synoptics while it is quite frequent in the gospel of John. While in the Syn God/the Father is never named in connection with this term, it is always named in Jn. In the Syn we find τὸν ἀποστείλαντά(με) as a descriptive circumloquium for God (Lk.10,16 and Mt.10,40 par.); in Jn it is never used in this manner. In Jn it is rather ὁ πέμψας(με) that is used: was it to avoid confusing Jesus with one of the many "sent ones" by a god in the pagan world?<sup>54</sup> From the 28 times that ἀποστέλλειν is used in Jn, 17 refer to Jesus' relation to the sender and, they are always found on his lips. This suggests that ἀποστέλλειν in this connection has great Christological importance for the Johannine tradition. Only in Lk.4,43 and Jn.3,17 is there a specific reason given for his having been sent. In the Johannine theology there was no need to precise any particular mission of Jesus as the sent one; the fact that when ἀποστέλλειν is used and the relation Jesus-God/the Father is (always!) indicated, means nothing

---

<sup>53</sup>Versus Bultmann, ST 155f. See Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 22f, and Jeremias, Promise 27. The passive aor. of ἀποστέλλειν is never used in Jn, as Jeremias pointed out.

<sup>54</sup>The only exception may be the final Johannine redactor's translation into Greek of Silōam, in 9,7, in as much as ἀπεσταλμένος may be intended to refer to Jesus as "the fountain of living water". Cf. C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge 1963, 184, and K. Müller, "Joh 9,7 und das jüdische Verständnis des Siloh-Spruches," BZ NF 13(1969), 251-256, esp. 256. Only John the Baptist, who was an important witness to Jesus, is called (ἄνθρωπος) ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, in Jn.1,6.

more than that Jesus' presence in the world as the sent one is an Epiphanic revelatory presence: he is the manifestation of God to the world; who sees Jesus and believes in him sees and believes in the sender.<sup>55</sup>

Our sketchy study of the ἀποστέλλειν-passages, when compared with the ἔρχεσθαι ones, allows us to infer that the former is a term used at a stage in tradition later than that when ἔρχεσθαι was predominant. This is suggested by the fact that most of the ἀποστέλλειν-sayings are found in Jn and are insertions made to an earlier text.

4. πέμπειν. This verb is most frequent in the Gospel of John, wherein it occurs 24 times. It always refers to the one who sent Jesus and is always found on his lips. While ἀποστέλλειν was never used as a title, πέμπειν is always used thus in Jn, which makes of it the nominal complement to the exclusively verbal use of ἀποστέλλειν. Ὁ πέμψας (με) is a circumloquium for God who reveals himself through Jesus. When the sender is explicitly named alongside ὁ πέμψας με it is always the Father (5,23.37; 6,44; 8,16.18; 12,49; 14,24). In Jn.4,34; 5,30; 6,38.39 and 12,49 Jesus' sending is said to take place in order to do the will of the sender, while 5,23.24.37; 6,44; 7,16.18.28; 8,16.18.26.29; 12,44.45; 13,20; 14,24; 15,21 present Jesus as the human revelation of God, as it is clearly phrased in 12,45:

ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με (cf. also 14,9).

In the Synoptics πέμπειν is never used to indicate Jesus' coming into the world. The only exception is the Lk version of the Parable of the Vineyard, where πέμπειν is found in 20,11a. 12a and especially v.13 which refers to Jesus:

εἶπεν (δε) ὁ κύριος... πέμψω τὸν υἱὸν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν.

The change from ἀποστέλλειν to πέμπειν is due to Lk, evidence of which is to be found in the "forgotten" (ἐξ)αποστέλλειν in v.10.

The only NT writing aside from the Gospels wherein we find πέμπειν as referring to Jesus is Rom.8,3:

ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς....

<sup>55</sup>See further the considerations put forward by E.Haenchen, "Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat," NTS 9(1962/63), 208-216, and Miranda, Der Vater 8-21.

It should be noted that neither ἀποστέλλειν nor πέμπειν is used as a title, i.e. Jesus is never called "the sent one." The predicate ὁ πέμψας (με), which refers to Jesus' relation to the Father, has its origin in the awareness that Jesus' coming into the world is wholly due to the Father's initiative, his revelatory and salvific will, which means that the sufferer of the action of ἀποστέλλειν is the revealer of God: in him the Father is seen and heard. The Son is the hand and the voice of the Father. Thus, πέμπειν, as ἀποστέλλειν, is an action-verb of Epiphanic character, and in this respect hardly differs from the uses of ἔρχεσθαι we have studied.<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, the terms ἔρχεσθαι and ἀποστέλλειν / πέμπειν bring forth particular nuances of their own which grosso modo can be described as follows:

### ἔρχεσθαι

- The initiative for the action concentrates on the one who performs it, i.e. who comes;
- it conceives the action as the personal (self) free-will of the one who comes;
- the viewpoint is prophetic; Jesus is the promised savior;
- it gives expression to the "whereto" and "what for" of Jesus' mission; it is Eschatological in outlook;
- the attention concentrates primarily on the "comer" and thus is mainly Christological; i.e. attention is directed to Jesus himself (ὁ ἐρχόμενος)
- it is expressed in the aorist (Syn) with a perfective sense or in the perfect (Jn) denoting a continuous presence;
- it describes an accomplishing action initiated by God (which is not explicitated); it is dynamic movement;

### ἀποστέλλειν/πέμπειν

- the initiative is thought as coming from the one who sends;
- it conceives the action as obedience and submission to the will of the sender;
- the viewpoint is that of revelation; Jesus is the revelation of God;
- it gives expression to the "wherefrom" of Jesus' origin; it is Protological in outlook; (heaven-bound);
- the attention concentrates primarily on the "sender" and thus is mainly Theological; i.e. attention is directed to God/the Father (ὁ πέμψας)
- it is expressed primarily in the aorist and expresses a historical punctual action;
- it explicitates whence the inertial action of coming originates;

<sup>56</sup>The Epiphanic character of these verbs of sending becomes more evident in the use of πέμπειν (Jn.14,26; 15,26; 16,7c), ἀποστέλλειν (Lk.24,49; 1 Pet.1,12) and ἔρχεσθαι (Mt.3,16; Jn.3,8b; 15,26; 16,7b.13; Acts 1,8; 19,6) for the coming of the Spirit.

- it embraces the totality of Jesus' life and work on earth, thus a reason for the coming is given (esp. in Syn);
- it embraces the totality of God's revelation qua revelation, i.e. as God's epiphany in Jesus; thus no specific reason for the sending is needed;
- the interest is more on the "what" (Was) of the event.
- the interest is more on the "that" (Dass) of the event.

5. Καταβαίνειν. Used to refer to Jesus' descent from heaven καταβαίνειν is found only in the gospel of John (1,51; 3,13; 6,33.38.41.42.50.51.58), and is a verbalization of the well known κατά- ανάβασις schema in Jn and predominant in Gnostic writings. In Jn it has an Epiphanic character and is taken from the OT, as is most evident in the uses in Jn.6: it pictures God "living in heaven".

In 1 Th.4,16 it refers to the Parousia, the time when the κύριος καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. In Eph.4,9f again we find the κατά- ανάβασις schema but applied to Christ's Incarnation and Glorification.

Καταβαίνειν is also used for the coming of the Spirit at Jesus' baptism in Mk.1,10 par. (and only here!) as well as for the coming of the mysterious angel that sat on the stone he had removed from Jesus' tomb, in Mt.28,2.

#### G. The Coming of the Baptist.<sup>57</sup>

The arrival on the scene of John the Baptist is described in different terms:

<u>Mt.3,1</u>	<u>Mk.1,4</u>	<u>Lk.3,2b.3a</u>	<u>Jn.1,6a.7a</u>
<u>παράγινεται</u> Ἰωάν.	<u>ἔγένετο</u> Ἰωάννης	<u>ἔγένετο</u> ἔφημα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην...	<u>ἔγένετο</u> ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ... οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν...
		καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν...	

There is no doubt that his presence is seen as that of an envoy of God (cf. Mk.1,2f par. = Mal.3,1 + Isa.40,3), sharing in the coming of the long-awaited beloved one of God, whom John characterized as the ὁ ἐρχόμενος. This is best captured by Mt when he introduces the public appearance of Jesus in the same terms as he did for the Baptist: παράγινεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς (3,13).

<sup>57</sup>On the coming of Elijah see c. Three, IV.

We have already studied the logion wherein Jesus spoke of the ascetic manner in which his forerunner had carried out his mission, in Mt.11,18/Lk.7,33. In an analogous manner Jesus bore witness to the righteousness of the Baptist's life when he told the Pharisees:

ἦλθεν (γὰρ) Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης  
καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ (Mt.21,32a)

wherein ἦλθεν has the implied sense of "he carried out his God entrusted mission," as indicated by the reproach, "and you did not believe him" --which supports our explanation of the sense of ἦλθον in the logia we studied.

Only in Jn.1,31 do we hear the Baptist speaking as an envoy, in a manner analogous to that used by Jesus in Mt.11,18f/Lk.7,33f:

ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ  
ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων.

The part. βαπτίζων describes the manner in which the main action, viz. ἦλθον, took place, i.e. his mission.

Finally, the uses of ἔρχεσθαι in connection with the future coming of the Son of Man are not to be forgotten. The fact that the verb ἔρχεσθαι is used throughout<sup>57</sup> and never φαίνειν or φανεροῦν,<sup>58</sup> is not only in conformity with Dan.7,13 but also attests to the epiphanic character of the verb ἔρχεσθαι when used in referring to the earthly appearance of the historical Jesus. This is all the more transparent in the gospel of John where Jesus employs ἔρχεσθαι when speaking of his future coming in 14,3.18.28; 21,22.23. Similarly in Acts 1,11c; 1 Cor.4,5b; 11,26b and 2 Th.1,10, as well as the frequent indications in the Apocalypse of the coming of the Lord.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>57</sup>Mt.10,23b; 16,27a par.; 16,28b; 24,30b par.; 24,44 par.; 25,31a; 26,64 par.; Lk.18,8, not to mention the indirect references (Mt.21,40 par.; 25,10.19; etc.) and the warning against false Messiahs in Mt.24,5 par.; Jn.10,8; 2 Cor.11,4; 2 Pet.3,3; and 1 Jn.2,18; 4,3.

<sup>58</sup>Noteworthy, φαίνειν is used for the appearance of the risen Christ only by Lk (in 24,11) and φανεροῦν only in Jn (21,1,14) and the long ending of Mk (16,12.14).

<sup>59</sup>Apoc.1,7; 5,7; 6,1.3.5.7; 16,15; 19,7; 22,7.12; 23,17.20.

### Conclusion.

The passages we have pointed out, wherein ἔρχεσθαι is used in a significant manner, support my earlier contention that the use of this verb in the ἦλθον-sayings, which constitute the object of our study, became important. If originally it served to form the idiomatic expression "my purpose/intention is to ...," as J. Jeremias held,<sup>60</sup> the early Church found a value and significance in this verb.

The fact that in the Synoptics it is especially the ἦλθον form of speech that predominates, in contrast with the frequent use of ἀποστέλλειν in John, is an indication of the difference in their outlooks and Christologies. The Synoptics' weight on ἔρχεσθαι is indicative of a Christology "from below" and its content refers to Jesus' messiahship, while the Johannine emphasis on the perf. ἐλήλυθα, ἀποστέλλειν and πέμπειν is indicative of a Christology "from above", which presents Jesus as the pre-existing and glorious Son of God (cf. 20,31). The development in understanding and appreciation of who Jesus was and what he continues to mean, reveals itself in as simple a trait as the vocabulary used. This development moves from the simple ἦλθον of the Synoptics to the Incarnational ἀποστέλλειν of John, -- already revealed by Lk in his explication of Mk.1,38d (ἐξ-ἦλθον) with ἀπεστάλην. A synthesis of both Christological outlooks is found in 1 Tim.1,15b. A tendency to point to Jesus' origin seems to be manifest in the Synoptics' replacement of the simple ἦλθον by "the Son of Man" in some logia.

The number of times that ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used, be it in a titular or a disguised manner, suggests that the early Church saw in Jesus the expected Messiah. This awareness lies behind many authoritative uses of ἦλθον and comes to the fore in the titular ὁ ἐρχόμενος and in significant uses of ἔρχεσθαι. By observing the uses of related verbs, the particular nuances and importance of the choice of ἔρχεσθαι to express the self-revelation of God comes sharply to the fore. It is not, however, a revelation for its own sake --it is for this reason that an infinitive of purpose is included.

---

<sup>60</sup>"Schicht" 167. Jeremias, however, does not take into account the subsequent relation logion-context, and the interpretative influence of the former on the latter.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### A NEW LOOK AT THE SYNOPTIC ΗΛΘΟΝ-LOGIA

In this final chapter we shall reconsider the ἡλθον-*logia* in the light of our research into uses of this form of speech outside the Synoptic Gospels, and in the light of known 1st cent. messianic expectations, as well as within the theological perspective of each Gospel.

#### A. ἡλθον in the Light of the OT, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

We have found no direct positive elucidation on the usage of the ἡλθον form of speech in the literature outside Palestine. In the Old Testament, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha however, we have found the following noteworthy usages of "to come" which by the via negativa circumscribe the significance of ἡλθον:

1. in the mouth of a human messenger, especially that of angels coming from God with the purpose of transmitting a message or of making a revelation. The use of ἡλθον in the Gospels, corresponds to neither of these. Jesus is not an angelus interpres: he is neither an angel nor a bringer of apocalyptic revelations. Furthermore, in none of our *logia* is there a question of simply bringing a message; they all are concerned with Jesus' soteriologically intended action and initiative. The only exception one could think of is Mt.5,17, but here too the "fulfilment" of the Law is to be understood in terms of words as well as deeds. Thus, it is unsatisfactory to propose that behind the Syn ἡλθον<sup>1</sup> lies the idea of Jesus the messenger.

2. "I have come" used emphatically to underline the presence of the one speaking (Num.22,38; Jos.5,14; 1 Sam.17,45). In our ἡλθον-*logia*, it is the infinitive of purpose that overshadows the "I have come" statement. It is, therefore, not an emphatic literary device. The emphatic ἡλθεν is found in Jn,

---

<sup>1</sup>In Jn ἀποστέλλειν is used, without indication of a specific purpose (except in 3,17), and often in relation to God/the Father, to indicate thereby Jesus' presence as revelatory: who sees Jesus sees the Sender (14,9).

where it is preceded by the pronoun ἐγώ (9,39; 10,10b; 12,46; 18,37; etc.).

3. Yahweh's theophanic appearances are sometimes described with the aid of the verb "to come" (eg. Ex.19,9; 20,24b; Hos.11,9). His presence is likewise made manifest in dreams and through angels. Jesus' presence among men, however, was not just "an apparition," but a historical --in time and space concretized-- presence as a man among men; it was neither spontaneous nor ethereal.

We can therefore reaffirm our earlier conclusion: the ἡλθόν of our logia does not reproduce that of the OT and related literature. Furthermore, the "I have come" of messengers falls short of that of Jesus and, Yahweh's theophanic "comings" excel the ἡλθόν of Jesus in so far as he does not thereby claim to be Yahweh; that may well be the Church's understanding but not Jesus'. We have here an upper (theophany) and a lower limit (messenger).

The fact that Yahweh uses "to come" to refer to his theophanic appearance, as well as to his future coming, and that no prophet ever uses this form of speech is not without interest. Prophets are sent; they are conscious of it and put it in words. Now, the use of ἡλθόν in the logia we are studying is, although stereotyped, not accidental but intentional and suggests that the choice of ἡλθόν, and not ἀπεστάλην, expresses both the self-willingness of his coming and the authority of one who is more than a prophet. This is further underlined by the use of Son of Man in some of our logia. The references made in the NT to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος are added indications of this. We are touching the messianic question (further §B).

4. A fourth, and by far the most abundant significant usage of the verb "to come", especially in the OT, is in connection with the future coming of Yahweh --what is generally classed as messianic expectations. Even if it is evident that the messianic announcements cannot be limited to the usage of any one term, it is nonetheless interesting to observe that the verb "to come" is not rarely used in texts that announce the future coming of Yahweh himself or of one of his special envoys. Thus, such important passages as Gen.49,10; Mal.3,1f;



Zech.2,14; 9,9; and Dan.7,13 speak of a future coming of a messianic personage. One may therefore wonder whether ἡλθον expresses the realization of the actualization of these and other announcements in the person of Jesus. Even though absolute certainty cannot be gained, we have to look at this possibility in greater detail.

A messianic realization captured in the apparently neutral ἡλθον is suggested by (1) the titular usage of the pregnant expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which we have studied in detail (p.288-300); (2) the coming of the Kingdom (cf. esp. Mk.11,10 par.); (3) the verbal reaction of the demons to Jesus' presence (cf. p.209-221), and (4) the Johannine usages of ἔρχεσθαι which we studied (esp. Jn.4,25; 7,31.41f). All of these place us in an eschatological perspective: they bring out the realization that with Jesus the new aeon has dawned, that God has pronounced his final and definitive word in the Word made flesh. This came clearly out in the demons' cry (Mk.1,24 par.; Mt.8,29), in the assurance given that Elijah, the forerunner of the Messiah, had already come (ἦλθες, Mk.9,13/Mt.17,12) --a dispute which is placed between the Transfiguration and the healing of a child with a demon!-- and in the Baptist's question whether Jesus is the ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Mt.11,3/Lk.7,19), to which the response is given in terms of the prophetic announcement of Isa.35,5 and 61,1 and finds an echo in the acclamation of the triumphant entry into Jerusalem.

It is noteworthy that the last reference in the Syn to Jesus' coming is the acclamation εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος at the triumphant entry into Jerusalem. It is the open recognition that Jesus' coming is the inauguration of the messianic era.

The eschatology that ἔρχεσθαι makes shine forth in the passages we have been considering is not a realized but an inaugurated eschatology.<sup>2</sup> This can be deduced not only from the fact that our ἡλθον-sayings have a unique paradigmatic value, which served as a basis for the Church's attitudes and

---

<sup>2</sup>Similarly Robinson, Jesus and His Coming 81 and passim, who describes it thus: "It looked, ..., not for another coming of Christ, but to the certain reduction of all things to the Christ who had come, and whose 'coming to his own', alike in victory and in visitation, was from now on the ultimate and most pressing reality with which men must reckon." (p.161).

orientations.<sup>3</sup> Such an eschatological outlook presupposes Jesus' messiahship, i.e. the early Church saw in ἡλθεν --independent of whether Jesus ever used this expression or not,-- an affirmation of Jesus' messiahship. The Church's view is expressed as much in the demons' cry as in the ὁ ἐρχόμενος passages.

## B. The ἡλθον-logia and Jesus' Messiahship.

We shall in the following pages reconsider the ἡλθον-logia in the light of the messianic conceptions of the 1st cent. focusing, therefore, on the infinitives of purpose. We concentrate here more on the content and the elucidations it may contribute toward a fuller understanding of the usage of ἡλθον than on the form.

1. The μὴ νομίσητε logia. Two logia, both only in Mt (5,17 and 10,34) have a prefatory clause in the form μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι .... These clauses were recognized to be due most probably to the final Mtan redactor. This clause, which is more than just a literary device for the sake of emphasis, was intended to prevent misunderstandings about Jesus' mission in relation to his messiahship which, in the light of current Jewish conceptions, Jesus apparently did not fulfil.

a. Mt.5,17 is the first of these logia. It was part of the living messianic expectations that the (Davidic) Messiah would settle all the disputes about the Law and provide the definite interpretation.<sup>4</sup> That Jesus would have done precisely this, even though in an unexpected manner, can be taken on the count of his messiahship.<sup>5</sup> The μὴ νομίσητε clause reaffirms that Jesus' purpose was not to abolish the Law --what we could translate by "not to act unmessianically".

Thus, from the point of view of content, Mt.5,17 by itself

<sup>3</sup>See Käsemann, "Anfänge" 175f.

<sup>4</sup>See esp. W.D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or Age to Come, Philadelphia 1952, Billerbeck III,570; IV/1,1ff, and P. Schäfer, "Die Torah der messianischen Zeit," ZNW 65(1974) 27-42 (bibliography in p.27).

<sup>5</sup>The monks of Qumran placed this role on the hands of the Teacher of Righteousness (cf. 1 QpHab.ii,8f; vii,4f; viii,2f), who nevertheless was not considered to be the Messiah --the Messiah are always spoken of in the future tense.

conforms to the current messianic expectations and ἤλθον can therefore be considered as a term that gives verbal expression to the coming of the Messiah, the coming of the one whom Scripture announced and the one who was eagerly awaited. It is, therefore, a pointer to the messianic age which was inaugurated by Jesus.

b. Mt.10,34 is the second logion having a μὴ νομίσητε clause. In contrast with Mt.5,17, this logion not only does not conform to current messianic expectations, but reaffirms in its μὴ νομίσητε clause an opposite stance.

According to 1st cent. Jewish expectations, the (Davidic) Messiah would bring peace to his people (cf. eg. Isa.9,5f; 11,6-9; 32,17f; 52,7; Mic.5,4; Zech.9,10; T.Levi 18,4); he would be called "Prince of Peace" (Isa.9,5f; cf. Billerbeck IV/2, 910f): This peace, conceived as this-worldly and in temporal terms, was not expected to be automatic but rather the result of the liberation of Israel from its oppressors and the subjection of all heathens to Israel's rule. That was the political platform of the Zealots, from whom Jesus dissociated himself.<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that the Messiah was to be the agent of peace, but the final and definitive peace would come from God himself (cf. eg. Isa.57,19; Ezek.34,25; 37,26).

The logion of Mt.10,34 provides a corrective, indeed an opposition to the nationalistic conception of the Messiah especially by the μὴ νομίσητε clause. It does not present an "unmessianic purpose" but warns that peace-bringing, especially as it was understood among Jews, was not Jesus' aim.<sup>7</sup> This corrective springs from the early Church and envisages Jesus' messiahship. However, it rallies behind the prophetic, but by now forgotten view that final peace would come only from God to the one who puts himself in his hands (already indicated in

---

<sup>6</sup>Jesus never presented himself as a nationalistic warrior or leader, nor was he understood as the Zealot-like Messiah (cf. Lk.24,21) that some scholars thought to discover, most recently S.G.F. Brandon in his book Jesus and the Zealots, Manchester 1967, to which M. Hengel, in his recension of Brandon's book in JSS 14(1969), 231-240, and in War Jesus Revolutionär?, Stuttgart 1970, and O. Cullmann, Jésus et les Révolutionnaires de son Temps, Neuchâtel 1970, among others, reacted.

<sup>7</sup>On the type of peace brought by Jesus see now E. Brandenburger, Frieden im Neuen Testament, Gütersloh 1973, esp.33-47.

Jer.6,14/8,11; 23,16f; Ezek.13,10.16; Mic.3,5.8) but departs in that it is hardly envisaged temporally.

Behind ἡλθον the Church saw therefore Jesus' messianic coming; this is the reason for which a corrective was felt necessary. Like Mt.5,17, the perspective is eschatological: not only is Jesus the Messiah but his coming confronts man and demands an abandonment of pre-conceptions to confidently follow the path he showed, where love replaces the Law as the way, and where the radicality of decision for and recognition of Jesus as the final and definite revelation of God is proved by the bearing of the unpeace it may bring along in this world.

2. The Logion Mk.2,17b par. This logion contradicts one of the constants in the veterotestamentary and later messianic ideas. The Messiah, who is conceived of as wholly righteous himself, would come for the sake of and to dwell among the righteous of Israel (cf. Jub.1,17.24f.28; 1 En.45,4; 62,14; 105,9).<sup>8</sup> In some quarters the delay of the expected coming of the Messiah was blamed on the sins of Israel (Ps.Sol.17,5; cf. Billerbeck I, 599f). The strict prohibition to associate with sinners, which certainly caused Jesus more than one confrontation with pious Jews, is one of the indications that it was inconceivable that the Messiah would be particularly concerned with the salvation of those considered as hopelessly lost, nay, that he make the primary object of his care the sinners and not the just ones.

Whether this logion had as a backdrop a reflection on any of the pictures of the Messiah is an open question; that it did on Jesus' mission is certain. The fact that Jews engaged in proselytizing activities (cf. Mt.23,15),<sup>9</sup> and that our logion may be understood in the mouth of one zealously engaged in such an activity, distances it from any messianic idea.<sup>10</sup> However,

<sup>8</sup>See Mowinckel, He that Cometh 308f.

<sup>9</sup>See further Billerbeck I, 924-931; II, 715-723.

<sup>10</sup>Harnack, "Ich bin gekommen" 8, did not consider it to be messianic on the grounds that this logion has for content neither the judgment nor the Kingdom of God. His criteria are too narrow and he has dissociated the logion from its context. To the contrary, Descamps, Justes 98 n.3, thinks that "Jésus fait plutôt allusion à sa mission messianique et divine"(!?).

the dialectic negative suggests a possible implicit corrective: "not so much the just --hence, no exclusion-- as the sinners." It breaks the exclusivist circle!

Once the logion was associated with the story of the banquet, it acquired a new significance --a messianic one-- and here we have a Church reflection. The picture of the banquet was one of the features of the messianic times and was not foreign to 1st cent. Judaism.<sup>11</sup> It occupies an important place in the NT as well where it is inseparable from the Kingdom of God. The end-time meal was to be in the company of the just ones.<sup>12</sup> The fact that Jesus here holds such a meal --whereby the "sinners" are really "just ones",-- as confirmed by the logia of Mk.2,17 par., implies that here the inbreaking of the (messianic) eschatological times is signified.

Thus, even though the logion itself does not conform to Jewish messianic expectations and therefore is "unmessianic", the relation with the banquet invests it with a messianic-eschatological character. It stands therefore as a corrective to Jewish conceptions about the Messiah and signals the eschatological import of Jesus' coming. Ἡλθον has, therefore, acquired a messianic-eschatological significance.

3. The "Son of Man" logia. Three logia, Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28; Lk.9,56a and Lk.19,10, were found to have had an earlier "I" form which was transformed into a SM-saying. Even though the SM is not a messianic figure in itself, it was painted with messianic traits: he is judge and lord over all peoples, justifier of the righteous. 1 En.48,10 and 52,4 designate him as "anointed one". By NT times the figures of the Messiah and of the SM had nearly blended together (cf. 4 Ezra 13; Mk.14,61f). We must therefore also ask whether with the introduction of the SM in these logia which refer to Jesus' earthly activity, any particular reason or intended signification was at work.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Isa.25,6; 1 En.42,3ff; 62,14; Pirke Abot 3,20. See further Billerbeck IV/2, 1146f and 1154-1158. We need not detain ourselves with an exposition of the role the banquet played in Qumran, esp. 1 QSa ii,17-22, on which there exists an abundant literature.

<sup>12</sup>See Billerbeck I, 992, as well as the references given in the previous footnote (n.11).

a. Mk.10,45/Mt.20,28, a double saying, the unification of which under the roof of the title "the Son of Man" need not be discussed again, should be treated as what they are, viz. two separate logia.

Mk.10,45a affirms that Jesus' mission was "to serve, not to be served." This runs directly against the messianic conceptions. Thus in Jer.30,8f we read: "They will be no longer the servants of aliens, but will serve Yahweh their God, and David their king whom I will raise up for them."<sup>13</sup> It is also contrary to the picture of a glorious SM. We may have in Mk. 10,45a a corrective (οὐκ... ἀλλὰ...) to these conceptions and, as if to underline it, the figure of the SM was introduced --the one on whom "was conferred sovereignty, glory and kingship" and to whom "men of all peoples, nations and languages became his servants" (Dan.7,14; cf. 1 En.46,5f). Jesus' service is evidently soteriologically oriented, as the addition of the following logion underlines.

Mk.10,45b appears likewise as a corrective on the part of the Church to messianic conceptions current at that time, in the light of Jesus' death and resurrection.<sup>14</sup> The death of the Messiah was expected in some circles (cf. 4 Ezra 7,26-44 and the Rabbinic interpretations of Zech.12,10), where the idea of an interim politico-nationalistic dominion of Israel before the final other-worldly one of God reigned.<sup>15</sup> However, his death was not conceived as an atoning death but as that of any human being. Furthermore, as is well known, the liberation brought about by the Messiah was conceived in nationalistic

<sup>13</sup>See further Billerbeck IV/2, 873-880.

<sup>14</sup>Hahn, Hoheitstitel 160, referring back to J. Wellhausen, also perceived this "nachträgliche Korrektur des Messiasbegriffs." See also J. Héring, "Messie juif et messie chrétien," in RHPR 18(1938), 419-431.

<sup>15</sup>See esp. Mowinckel, He that Cometh 325-333, and Billerbeck II, 274-292. Mowinckel affirms, in p.327, that the death of the Messiah was not prevalent in Jesus' time. However, there is no proof of this and the expectation of a nationalistic Messiah suggests the contrary. Thus the appearance of many false messiahs who failed: Ezekiah, executed by Herod (cf. Josephus, Wars i,204,256; Ant.xiv,159,167; xvii,271), his son Judas the Galilean (cf. Wars ii,56), the prophet Theudas (ca. 44 A.D., in times of Cuspius Fadus; cf. Acts 5,36 and Ant.xx, 97f), the Egyptian executed by the procurator Felix in ca.58 A.D. (Acts 21,38; Ant.xx,169ff) and Bar Kochba, hailed as a messiah by R. Akiba (cf. bSanh.93b and jTa'anit 68d).

terms (see Lk.24,21!): of Israel, to whom all other nations would be subjected and on whom their eyes would be fixed.

The fact that in Mk.10,45b we have a logion about the SM giving his life for the many provides a different outlook: he, the messianically conceived Son of Man, (1) does die, and (2) an atoning death, (3) not just for Israel.

It is noteworthy that the Passion predictions always refer to the SM, and this is no sheer accident; this is also the case with Mk.10,45b. But, in none of these is it said that he will die "as a ransom for many", which is a new element brought into the picture of the SM. Mk.10,45b is the last direct announcement of his death (discounting the allusions in the words of Institution) and also the one which gives the ultimate meaning of his death. Thereafter it is the glorious "Danielic" SM that is solemnly presented for consideration (Mk.13,26; 14,62).

The Son of Man in Jewish conceptions was a glorious figure, not a suffering one, and his appearance is mainly to judge; these are two aspects of the one who "comes on the clouds". However, nothing is said in the OT and related literature about earthly wanderings of the SM. This aspect is the one provided in the NT. The usage of Son of Man in connection with Jesus' forthcoming death provides not just a corrective but an expansion. This expansion, which centers on his earthly life, is precisely the presence of the Messiah-SM. The earthly Messiah is none other than the to-be-glorious SM. Thus, the logion of Mk.10,45a could also be assigned to the Son of Man.

b. Lk.19,10 has as background the figure of the shepherd, variously painted in Ezek.34; 37,24; Jer.50,6; Zech.11; 1 En. 90,13-38; Ps.Sol.11; 17,45f; 2 Bar.77,16. The oldest form of Lk.19,10 is a direct echo of Ezek.34,16, and as such fits squarely in the Jewish picture of Yahweh the shepherd who will gather the scattered (in the Diaspora) of the house of Israel.<sup>16</sup> The logion by itself, like Mt.15,24, shows no universalistic

---

<sup>16</sup>The gathering of the Chosen People would be realized by God himself --on the basis of the Exodus gathering. See the references given in Billerbeck I, 599; II, 536f; IV/2, 906ff. God's gathering of nations was not always nationalistic conceived, thus Isa.66,18: "I am coming to gather all nations and tongues...." But this was not the predominant outlook in Jesus' time.

concerns and in its earliest form corresponds to the messianic expectations prevalent in Jesus' time. By the posterior addition of καὶ σῶσαι and the substitution of the "I" for a SM form of speech the logion was invested with a wider outlook. In fact, the SM was never conceived of in purely nationalistic terms, even though there was a tendency to clothe him with the features of the Davidic Messiah (as in 1 En.37-71).<sup>17</sup> He was conceived of first and foremost as a glorious transcendental eschatological being, as in Dan.7; he will have dominion over all peoples and is to be the universal judge.

The fact that in Lk.19,10 the SM's purpose is "to seek and save the lost", a task that Judaism did not assign to their messianically conceived Son of Man but reserved only for God, suggests that here we have a correction to the current messianic outlook and an expansion of the SM conception. The SM is not just a transcendental heavenly figure; he is not only judge and vindicator. The seeking of "the lost" is also the task of the Messiah and it is not limited to those belonging to the house of Israel (cf. the Parable of the Mines, which follows our pericope!). The seeking and gathering of "the lost" (or scattered) was for Judaism an eschatological, end-time, event which Lk.19,10 presents without barriers --not limited to Israel.

c. Lk.9,56a underlines in sharper terms the corrective and expansion to the messianically conceived SM. The corrective is given by the tipping of the balance from destruction (ἀπολέσαι) to the side of salvation (σῶσαι) --cf. 4 Ezra 13,38; 1 En.69,27. The expansion is provided precisely by the inclusion of a universally (ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων) oriented salvific role.

d. The Meaning of ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

The three SM-logia we have reconsidered have revealed a great similarity in outlook, which can well be thought to have been already captured in the early Church's expression "the Son

<sup>17</sup>See esp. Tödt, SM 22-31; Mowinckel, He that Cometh 335ff, 360; Sjöberg, Menschensohn 141ff, and Klausner, Messianic Idea 230, 291ff.



of Man came".

i. These logia are soteriological in content: to give his life as a ransom and to grant salvation. Both are exclusive and intransferable purposes of Christ, which the Church cannot effect by herself; behold a fundamental difference from the "I have come" sayings! The introduction of the SM is here, as in the Passion predictions, soteriologically oriented.

ii. These logia point to the dawning of the eschatological times: it is the Son of Man, an eschatological figure, who has made his appearance in the person of Jesus. The soteriological purpose for his coming is eschatologically oriented.

iii. In the statement "the Son of Man came" Jesus' messiahship is indirectly affirmed. The SM had become a messianically clothed figure. There is no doubt that this was the Church's understanding when SM was used as much for Jesus' earthly life as for his glorious reappearance (eg. in Mk.13,26; 14,62 par.). However, it is not so much Jesus' messiahship as the eschatological import of his coming that is underscored: it is an ephapax event, not to be repeated till "the Son of Man come in his glory".

#### 4. The Authentic Logion: Lk.12,49.

Lk.12,49 is an obscure logion which most probably goes back to Jesus himself; its elucidation was attempted by the addition of v.50 and their insertion in the present context. Even though it is not absolutely certain, it is very probable that originally the "fire" referred to the divine judgment.<sup>18</sup>

The logion we possess does not say that it is Jesus who will exercise judgment. The kindling of the "fire", which is left in God's hands, has not yet taken place: τί θέλω ἀνήφθῃ; βαλεῖν is to be taken as a futuristic aorist.<sup>19</sup> Since OT times,

<sup>18</sup>The fact that the figure of the SM was not introduced supports this probability: it is only at the Lord's second coming that he will appear as SM and judgment will be exerted (note the ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν; not less suggestive is βαλεῖν), not before.

<sup>19</sup>It may, however, be an ingressive aor. inasmuch as the logion could be understood as stating that his purpose is to occasion or bring about God's judgment. The logion has nevertheless a futuristic orientation. The outlook corresponds to that expressed elsewhere, eg. in Mt.25,32 (συναχθήσονται: by God!), where the judgment is given to Christ but is the final task of God himself.

divine judgment was understood to be in God's hands,<sup>20</sup> even if the development of messianic hopes placed the power to exert God's judgment on the hands of the Messiah (eg. Isa.9,7; Ps. Sol.17,18),<sup>21</sup> especially on those of the Son of Man, who is pictured as sitting on a throne.<sup>22</sup> From this cursory description, and given the fact that in contemporary Judaism the nationalistic figure who would exert judgment predominated, our logion does not present itself nor picture someone of messianic character. It is, however, interesting to observe that the two inseparable traits characteristic of the messianic age, viz. judgment and peace (see already Isa.9,6f), have been placed together (Lk.12,49.51).<sup>23</sup> This suggests that by the time these were tied, Lk.12,49 was messianically understood. Thus, while ἡλθον (+ inf.) originally limited itself to the statement of a purpose, when related to v.51 it acquired a messianic significance inasmuch as in the light of Jesus' cross (v.50!) and resurrection it signals the coming of the eschatological times in the coming of Jesus.<sup>24</sup>

### Conclusion.

Some of the logia which are due to the prophetic mouth of the Church had a direct messianic connotation; thus the final interpretation of the Law (Mt.5,17) and the seeking of the lost (Lk.19,10). Other logia, of same origin, offer a corrective to certain messianic expectations; thus the announcement of strife

<sup>20</sup>See F. Büchsel, art. κοίνω, in TDNT III, 924ff, 931f; P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde, Tübingen 1934<sup>2</sup>, passim.

<sup>21</sup>See the observations of Mowinckel, He that Cometh 273, 312f, 319, as well as Billerbeck I, 978; IV/2, 1110.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Mowinckel, op.cit. 393-399, and the references there given. This association is predominant in the Syn, on which see Büchsel, art.cit. 936ff.

<sup>23</sup>This supports the previously expressed suspicion when Lk.12,49 had been studied in detail (c.I §II), viz. that the original and the final redactors' understanding of this logion was in terms of the eschatological judgment. Note that Isa. 66,16 presents fire and the sword as God's instruments of judgment!

<sup>24</sup>We have a heilsgeschichtliche trajectory: announcement of the eschatological judgment and wish that it take place (v. 49), Jesus' death (v.50), the indication that the end-times broke in --not peace but division (v.51) on account of the split the person of Jesus and acceptance or rejection of Jesus' messiahship causes.

and the idea of a non-political peace (Mt.10,34), the universality of salvation (Mk.2,17b par.; Lk.9,56a), and the SM's life of service up to an atoning death "for many" (Mk.10,45 par.). Finally, the assumed authentic logion, viz. Lk.12,49, is hardly messianically oriented: Jesus does not claim to exercise the divine judgment himself but prepares for it and hopes God will effect it soon --and this not politically conceived! Jesus does not speak as the awaited national leader of political liberation.

### C. The Messianic Consciousness and the ἡλθον-logia.

A natural corollary of all the considerations we have so far put forward, and one that is of particular interest to the theologian, is that of Jesus' so-called "messianic consciousness." A few observations that our study of the ἡλθον-logia suggest about this subtle question seem necessary.<sup>25</sup>

The first task that seems to me to be important is to clarify our vocabulary. One should distinguish between "consciousness" and "knowledge": the former is primarily an awareness of something, the latter refers to intellectual certitude; while the former proceeds from reflection and often springs from intuition --and consequently is subjective/psychological,-- the latter is gained from and refers to sensible experience, capable of being verbally objectivized.<sup>26</sup>

Turning to our logia: on the one hand, from our examination of the possible authenticity of each ἡλθον-logion, we found that only one has high probability of being ipsissima verba Iesu, viz. Lk.12,49. Two logia, viz. Mk.2,17b par. and Mt.10,34b, could have been uttered by Jesus in some form and, therefore, may be ipsissima vox Iesu, but this remains quite doubtful. The remaining logia are prophetic utterances of the early

<sup>25</sup> A more detailed study of the question of Jesus' consciousness, from the pen of exegetes, will be found in the articles of A. Vögtle, "Exegetische Erwägungen über das Wissen und Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," in idem, Das Evangelium und die Evangelien, Düsseldorf 1971, 296-344 (esp.334-342); O. Betz, "Die Frage nach dem Messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu," in NovT 6(1963), 20-48; F. Mussner, "Wege zum Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," in BZ NF 12(1968), 161-172, and R.E. Brown, Jesus God and Man, Milwaukee 1967, 79-99 (esp.93-99).

<sup>26</sup> See further the observations of Brown, op.cit. 93f.

Church or, if one wishes, of the risen Christ speaking through the Church. On the other hand, in our reconsideration of these logia in the light of the messianic expectations, the authentic logion as well as the less certain ones did not reveal to have as content any evident function which Judaism expected from the Messiah. In fact, "to call the sinners" and "not to bring peace but the sword" contradict two of the constants of the Jewish messianic expectations. The wish that actual divine judgment take place appears as a prophetic utterance of what the Messiah was expected to effect in the name of God. Nevertheless, these logia are messianic pointers that make the preconceptions burst out of the narrow mold in which they had been cast. "To call sinners" points to the universal Kingdom and God's paternal love for men, which Jesus preached. To bring strife and not political peace points to the transcendental quality of the Kingdom that Jesus preached. To long for the initiation of the divine judgment, which Jesus announced to be near, points to the importance he attached to his mission. These are correlated.

The fact that these logia, especially the authentic one, are not direct messianic --within the frame of known messianic expectations-- affirmations, cautions us not to read into them more than what they say. We must beware not to project a post-paschal Church understanding onto the historical Jesus. We must therefore admit that none of the ἡλθον-logia reveals a messianic knowledge on the part of Jesus himself. Whether any of these, especially Lk.12,49, are expressions of a messianic consciousness is difficult to ascertain on account of their content. By form and content these logia spring from a more than simple prophetic consciousness; there is an awareness of definiteness in them.

The general impression one gains from what today is known as an "implicit Christology" is that Jesus was aware of the significance of his teaching and behavior, guided by the Spirit, and that he had the certitude not only of being on God's side but of having grasped and doing his authentic will; it is for this reason that he can refer to God as his father (Mk.1, 10f). This springs from the intuitive consciousness he had about himself in relation to his mission. Lk.12,49 --and also

Mk.2,17b par. and Mt.10,34b-- wherein it is the mission and not the "missionary" that bears all the weight, reveals an operative and not an ontological self-consciousness. There is no explicit Christology verbalized in it; it is not concerned with "who says this" but with "what is being said." This, therefore, makes it possible to admit that Jesus could have used the pregnant expression "I have come to ...." The early Church turned its attention to the ontological and projected onto the person of Jesus its understanding of his messiahship and the significance of his coming, especially by the use of titles of sovereignty.

The ἡλθον-logia which we have singled out (especially Lk. 12,49) allow us to discover an operative (or functional) self-consciousness which led Jesus to preach and effect what he did. It is more a vocation-consciousness (Sendungsbewusstsein) than a self-consciousness (Selbstbewusstsein) that is expressed in these logia which approach us of Jesus. If we consider the oldest ἡλθον-logia from the standpoint of a "messianic consciousness", we can say no more than that behind these there is more than just a prophetic consciousness (in contrast with the prophets of old) and less than what in the strict sense is understood by "messianic consciousness".

#### D. The ἡλθον-logia in the Perspective of the Evangelists.

A word should be said about the ἡλθον-logia in the perspective of each evangelist, when grouped by Gospels. To avoid repeating the more detailed study of each logion, I shall be extremely brief.

##### 1. The ἡλθον-logia of the Gospel of Mark.

There are only two ἡλθον-logia in the gospel of Mark: 2,17b and 10,45. These can be said to summarize Jesus' activity on earth: to call "sinners" to enter the Kingdom, to follow his path, and to give himself totally to the service of men, up to the bitter end. In the first logion it is the purpose there indicated that predominates, while in the second the intention and the person (SM!) are equally important. No Mkan peculiarity can be deduced from these logia, save for the importance that 10,45b, which captures the soteriological dom-

inance that the Passion finds in Mk, has in this gospel. Jesus is the Suffering (10,45b) Servant (10,45a). This logion does not spring from a particular situation, as 2,17b does, but is a solemn statement about Jesus, the Son of Man, who came to save many; a key Christological statement of the early Church. The two logia are, as is the dominant trait in Mk, soteriological sayings: Jesus came to offer salvation to men.

## 2. The ἡλθον-logia of the Gospel of Matthew.

Only one ἡλθον-logion is found exclusively in the gospel of Mt: 5,17, concerning Jesus' position vis-à-vis the Law --10, 34 is found in Lk.12,51, even if altered. This is easily understandable inasmuch as Mt, who has to deal with a predominantly Judeo-Christian community, gives particular importance to this question. This logion has to be understood in the light of the one principle which Mt stresses: love of God and neighbour as the basis and end of all law (7,11f; 22,36-40). Mt's purpose in preserving and reorienting an ἡλθον-logion on this question is not just to correct probable misunderstandings of Jesus' intention but to give the reason for the properly Christian conception of the Law, viz. in Jesus' accomplishment of the Scriptures and his revelation of God's real will, two reasons inseparable in Mt. A question so important to Mt is dealt with in an ἡλθον formulated logion. It is a fundamental principle of Christian life that is established on the foundations of a fundamental event: the coming of the son of David to inaugurate the Kingdom which has love for its fundamental law. To "fulfil Law and Prophets" implies a salvific-historical appreciation of Jesus as the one who accomplishes the past and perfects it for the future.

The logion of 9,13b, found in the same context as Mk's and Lk's, nevertheless presents Jesus in a different light --that of an authoritative teacher (διδάσκαλος)-- and once again confronts God's will with the Jewish legalism by referring to Hos.6,6. This way the ἡλθον-saying is a confirmation of Jesus' conformity to God's will.

The logion of 10,34 is placed in a context wherein decision for Christ is demanded (diff. Lk), and this at any price. The ἡλθον-saying is the core of this section (10,16-42). Jesus'

messiahship and the eschatological impact of his coming linger in the background. In the context of Mt's gospel the rejection of Jesus, especially by the Jews, is in the background as well. To commit oneself to Christ and to follow in his steps are the criteria of appurtenance to the new Israel. In this logion, with its three ἡλθον-clauses, Mt envisages the beginning of the end (cf. 24,9-12 and the repeated calls to vigilance and prudence).

Finally, the ransom saying (20,28) offers no Mtan particularity in itself and is kept in the same context as Mk. However, the aspect of service (v.28a) must have been more important for Mt than that of suffering (which is the important aspect for Mk). Like 9,13, Jesus does God's will for the sake of the Kingdom of God.

The sayings in Matthew are instructions for the community and cover two essential aspects of the true Israel: the Law is to serve the promotion of love and finds all its sense therein (5,17; 9,13), and heeding the call of Christ means forgetting oneself (10,34; also 20,28). This is founded on affirmations of Christ (5,17; 10,34) and Jesus' own example (9,13; 20,28). Jesus is presented as an authoritative teacher who teaches and does God's loving but non-compromising will; that is what he came for. In the first three logia, which are marked by Mt's outlook and concerns, the weight lies on the "what", i.e. on the teaching, and the one speaking falls into the background for he is the Lord ever present in the community. These three logia are Scripture-related: 5,17 deals with the OT as a whole, and 9,13 and 10,34 are legitimated and enlightened by the prophets (Hos.6,6; Mic.7,6); ἡλθον, therefore, implicitly suggests a relation to the OT. Indeed, although not stated, this can be deduced from Mt's understanding of Jesus as the Messiah sent by God to Israel as promised and foretold. Finally, behind these logia the Mtan confrontation with a Rabbinic (Pharisaic) oriented Judaism on account of Jesus' messiahship can be detected.

### 3. The ἡλθον-logia of the Gospel of Luke.

In Luke there are three ἡλθον-logia which have no parallels: 9,56a; 12,49 and 19,10. Of these, the one most in consonance with the tenor of this gospel is 19,10. In this logion

one of Lk's most cherished themes comes to the fore: Christ's initiative to seek the lost in order to offer them salvation. It is prefaced by two other aspects that mark the gospel of Lk, viz. detachment (v.8) and the suggested joyful (v.6) intimacy with Jesus (v.7). Here the coming of Jesus is that of the kyrios (v.8a! a title of Lk's predilection and containing a messianic ring), who appears as the σωτήρ of men. This logion occupies in Lk the place that 10,45 occupies in Mk and 5,17 in Mt. Closely related is 9,56a.

The logion of 5,32 is couched in the background of an anticipatory messianic background (δοχὴν μεγάλην, v.29a). Two elements are indicative in this logion: the perf. ἐλήλυθα, which not only looks back at the totality of Jesus' mission and earthly life as a past event, but also forward to Christ's continuous presence, and εἰς μετάνοιαν, which in the Lkan perspective is an invitation to liberate oneself of any self-sufficiency in order to be open and be able to entrust oneself wholly in God's hands; μετάνοια is a fundamental exigency in Lk (cf. 24,47a). Here again Jesus appears as the savior who does not cease to seek the lost.

Finally, in 12,49 (and v.51ff, which Lk relates to v.49) Lk's eschatological outlook finds solid support. This logion is in a context wherein Christians are exhorted to remain watchful (12,35-56), for the change of aeons has taken place. Jesus appears here as the one on whom the eschatological momentum depends.

Lk, in contrast to Mt, apparently finds little use for the ἦλθον form of speech. He has preserved 12,49 because it fitted his composition of c.12 and because he received it from tradition as a Jesus-logion. However, he changed ἦλθον to παρεγενόμην in 12,51, to the perf. tense in 5,32 (as in 7,33.34/Mt.11, 18.19), and he kept the SM in 9,56a and 19,10. The explanation for this is probably found in his particular conception of history. For Lk, we are well into the new times inaugurated since the public appearance of Jesus (3,21f; 16,16) and the earthly ministry of Jesus belongs to the past; what now reigns and matters is the present time in which we are --a time of the continuous presence of the Spirit. Lk's sight is set on the



future, to which the present is to be accommodated. We may thus understand his uses of the perf. tense in 5,32 and 7,33f, and of the SM in 9,56a and 19,10, all of which preserve their actuality --and should be related to the question of 18,8. The perspective is indeed eschatological, as is evident in 12,49. Thus, the only trait common to the ἡλθον-logia in Lk is the fact that they are eschatologically oriented. They are less concerned with Jesus' past ministry than with their end-time orientation and significance, less with Christology than with Eschatology.

## C O N C L U S I O N

After having considered and re-considered the ἡλθεν-logia from different angles and under different lights, we have reached the point when we should gather all the partial results and attempt a synthesis of our study. In order to avoid being overly repetitious, I shall summarize the most important results by simply stating them without greater explanation.<sup>1</sup>

1. All the ἡλθεν-logia had had a separate existence before being integrated into their present contexts. None is a creation of the final redactor.

2. The Son of Man-logia we have studied were originally "I"-sayings. The introduction of SM took place in a Judeo-Christian milieu. It was used in sayings having for their content Jesus' soteriological activity as a whole and the OT as a direct background. In these sayings Jesus' historical mission is contemplated. It is noteworthy that the more markedly eschatological logia (Lk.12,49; Mt.10,34) have not been changed to SM-sayings.<sup>2</sup> The use of SM brings out at once the authority and the doxa of Jesus. In every case it results in a paradox: to serve, not to be served; to seek and save the lost, not to abandon and condemn them. The coming of the SM is related and analogous to the coming of the Kingdom of God; the SM came, and so the Kingdom has been inaugurated on earth.

3. Not all the ἡλθεν-logia originated in the same moment of tradition. While Lk.12,49 goes back to Jesus, and Mk.2,17b and Mt.10,34b are doubtful, the other ἡλθεν-logia are Church products. The οὐκ...ἀλλὰ... form, which contains a corrective idea, most probably originated in the early Palestinian

---

<sup>1</sup>For a partial expansion of these final conclusions, see those at the end of Part One. When I speak of ἡλθεν-logia I also have the SM-logia in mind, unless these are explicitly distinguished.

<sup>2</sup>Lohmeyer's contention, Mt 105, that "I" was kept in the logia having an eschatological object, and SM was used in those referring to Jesus' historical mission does not hold as strictly as he states it; Mk.2,17b par. and Lk.19,10 have, in the final analysis, the same object yet only the latter is a SM-saying.

Church. The substitution of the "I" form of speech for "the Son of Man" represents the last moment in the transmission of some of the ἡλθον-logia, discounting the alterations made to some of these by RMt and RLk. That there was no systematic use of ἡλθον-formulated logia can be deduced from their infrequency.

4. Of all the ἡλθον-formulated logia only two were found to be authentic sayings of Jesus: Lk.12,49 and 7,33f/Mt.11,18f. Two logia are quite doubtful: Mk.2,17b and Mt.10,34b. There is, therefore, no reason for doubting that Jesus may have used ἡλθον/ἦλθον.<sup>3</sup>

5. The "inauthentic" ἡλθον-sayings look back at the totality of Jesus' mission as seen and grasped by the early Church. This is not the case with the authentic sayings wherein ἡλθον has the present sense that the Aramaic ܐܬܢܐ can have.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, there is no question of Jesus' pre-existence being explicitated in these logia, except for possible implicit allusions in the uses of "Son of Man".<sup>5</sup>

6. That ἡλθον was put on Jesus' lips to express the historical event of his coming is deducible not only from the ἡλθον-logia, the substitutions for SM, and the demons' cry, but especially in the titular use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which is the zenith of the Christological uses of ἐρχεσθαι and lingers in the background of ἡλθον. Furthermore, that attention was paid to the fact and significance of the event of Jesus' coming can be deduced from the above as well as the question about Elijah's coming. These uses indicate that ἐρχεσθαι expressed an escha-

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann, ST 155, had declared that Lk.12,49 and Mk.2,17b "do not come under positive suspicion," but concluded that, given that the other ἡλθον-logia are Church products, these offer "little confidence" of not having had the same origin as the other logia --which he does not prove. In his NTTh I, 44, Bultmann is more cautious: "They are scarcely (at least in the majority of cases) original words of Jesus, but mostly products of the Church." See further Fuller, Christology 127f.

<sup>4</sup>Jeremias has often insisted on this (versus Bultmann); thus also Frövig, Sendungsbewusstsein 137, and Michel, "Ich komme" 124.

<sup>5</sup>The use of SM does not necessarily mean that Jesus' pre-existence is being contemplated, and in our logia it is certainly not in the forefront, even if "SM + to come" suggests it on account of the echo it has in Dan.7,13f.

tological concept.

7. From the ἡλθον-logia Jesus' so called "messianic consciousness" cannot be deduced. In none is there a direct messianic claim. The actual messianic allusions, be it in a logion itself (Mt.5,17; 10,34; Mk.10,45; Lk.19,10) or be it deducible from the context (Mk.2,17; Lk.12,49), are due to the early Church's reflections on the significance of Jesus' coming and earthly life in the light of the Resurrection. The messianic outlook that predominates is the Davidic (royal) one, which is the result of the Church's meditation on Scripture. Furthermore, there is no question of Jesus' simply fulfilling prophetic announcements. As he accomplishes the Scriptures, so also he perfects the eschatological hopes, nay, even corrects them, and brings them into sharp focus according to God's universal salvific will.

8. Already in the authentic logia, ἡλθον is an authoritative manner of speaking and, together with the purpose indicated, reveals Jesus' more than prophetic awareness of his vocation --a mission consciousness of one filled with the spirit of God. ἤλθον furthermore suggests the freedom with which Jesus willingly assumed his mission as well as his initiative --a fundamental difference from ἀποστέλλειν. Later uses rendered ἡλθον + inf. into an early stereotyped Christological mission formula in the style of a messianically conscious programmatic statement of a pre-ordained mission fulfilment.

9. The expression "I have come" implies a spatial dimension: a whence and a whereto. We can affirm that Jesus came from God and to the world only because we believe, because we now know that he is the Christ, sent by God. The origin (from God) and the destination (to the world) were of importance in the Johannine circles, but not in those of the Synoptics in whose gospels the ἡλθον-logia never refer to these questions.

10. In the logia we have studied, ἡλθον + inf. showed two basic meanings. When the logia existed separately, unaffected by their present contexts, the basic and direct sense was, "my purpose/intention is to ...." When placed in their present contexts, because of the Christological orientation

and significance of the whole complex, ἦλθον + inf. acquired the meaning of, "my God-given mission/task is to ..."; here it approaches ἀπεστάλην. In the earlier stage, ἦλθον had no significance of its own; significance was given by the context. The weight, however, remains on the infinitive of purpose. This inf. of purpose takes the place of the classical future participle which was much in disuse by the time the NT began to be written. Only in the SM-logia is "the Son of Man came" and the inf. of purpose of equal importance. Never, however, does ἦλθον overshadow the infinitive. The "what" is in the forefront and indirectly leads to the inquiry for the (assumed-known) "who". The middle term between these is the "coming" itself.

11. The study of ἦλθον and related verbs, especially in the Gospels, has shown that there is a presumably traceable development in these because of a deeper understanding of Jesus. On the lips of Jesus,

i. ἦλθον is the earliest form, especially attested by the authentic logia. A tendency to multiply this form of speech --although strikingly limited!-- is discernible.

ii. "The Son of Man came" corresponds to a second stage; SM replaces an earlier "I".

iii. A third moment in the Christological understanding of Jesus' coming is expressed in the Johannine "God/the Father ἀπέστειλεν" Jesus to the world. It represents a Christological precision in that it explicates in a salvific-historical perspective the "wherefrom" and the "whereto". In this form of speech it is the ἀπέστειλεν that is the center of interest --so much so that either there is no purpose specified (already in Mt.15,24) or it is simply revelatory. Correspondingly, God/the Father is the "sender".<sup>6</sup>

iv. The sharpest Christological expression is the Johannine ἐξῆλθον. Here Jesus' origin (pre-existence?) is in the forefront; it gathers the form of the personal statement of ἦλθον (1st person; personal initiative) and the dynamism of God

<sup>6</sup>Against Bultmann, ST 155f, who contends that Jn shows that "ἐλθεῖν and ἀποσταλῆναι (or πεμφθῆναι) are typical of the terminology of a later time."

ἀπέστειλεν Jesus to the world.

12. The origin of the "I have come + inf." form of speech is found in Palestinian soil, where  $\aleph\aleph/\aleph\aleph$  + inf. was used idiomatically to express purpose, intentionality, as well as a task or function to accomplish. It grew in a Judeo-Christian milieu, and propitious ground for the expansion of this "formula" was found in the OT (and related) announcements of the coming of the Messiah.

13. The end of the messianic waiting and the beginning of the new covenant was captured in the verb ἔρχεσθαι: it became an eschatological concept --hence the question about Elijah's coming, the cry of the demons and at the triumphant entrance.<sup>7</sup> Thus the inf. of purpose of our logia is always eschatologically oriented. The eschatological significance of ἦλθον is all the more striking in that it is never found in the mouth of prophets, while ἔρχεσθαι is not rarely used in the messianic announcements. ἦλθον points therefore to a decisive event made manifest in the mission of Jesus. It contrasts with the coming of the Baptist (Mt.11,13f; 11,18f par.; 17,10ff) and is contrary to the coming of "thieves and assassins" (Mk.4,15 par.; 13,6 par.; Mt.7,15; 13,25; Jn.10,1.8.10) and of the false Messiah. The Christological uses of ἔρχεσθαι anchor the Jesus-event in history: a historical event describable as a coming (i.e., an ἦλθον) took place in time and space (cf. 1 Jn.4,2; 2 Jn.7). If ἦλθον points to the historicity of the Jesus-event, the infinitives of purpose paint different facets of Jesus' soteriologically intended mission. It can be affirmed, with E. Käsemann, that the ἦλθον-logia are "so etwas wie erste Summarien des Evangeliums."<sup>8</sup> They lie at the heart of the Good News: Jesus came to offer salvation by word and deed.

14. The Church's reflection on Jesus' soteriological mission and its formulation in ἦλθον-sayings, suggests that ἔρχεσθαι became part of the epiphanic circle of ideas.<sup>9</sup> Jesus'

<sup>7</sup>It is noteworthy that ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used for the historical coming of Jesus and for the Parousia (Mt.23,39).

<sup>8</sup>"Anfänge" 176.

<sup>9</sup>It is also used for the 2d coming, eg. in Mt.10,23; 16,27.28; 23,39; 24,30.42.44; 25,31.

historical coming constitutes the most concrete --i.e. not in dreams, visions and alike-- epiphany of God made manifest through his ἔργα and δύνανται Θεοῦ, and especially confirmed by the Resurrection. Jesus' whole life-career was a coming. It is a personal epiphany: it is Jesus, not someone else, who walked on this earth and showed men by word and deed the path that leads to the Father. Within the broader frame of salvation history, it refers to the past (OT messianism) and projects to the future (eschatological significance). The Jesus-event is a "Christophany" --not a theophany in the OT and religion historical sense-- which, as all epiphanies, is expressed with a verb: he came and will come again. Moreover, it constituted not a neutral coming but one with a precise purpose. It is the mission that occasioned the coming(!) and conversely, if Jesus had not come there would have been no real seeking of the lost, no redemptive death, no fulfilling of the Law. The latter presupposes the former. The significance of his coming was understood in the light of Jesus' words and deeds, on which especially the Resurrection projected the necessary light; thus in the ἡλθον-*logia* it is still the purpose/mission that is the center of attention. A growing realization of the significance of Jesus' coming itself, as an eschatological event, can be seen in the uses of Son of Man and especially of the absolute ὁ ἐρχόμενος. It developed from the "what" to the "who", i.e. there was a "kerygmaticizing" process.

15. The ἡλθον-*logia* were neither preserved nor uttered by the prophetic mouth of the Church just for the sake of telling what once happened. They concern the heart of the Good News and serve as criteria for the Church's own mission and of Christian life at large. These verbal statements about Jesus' mission, which capture the soteriological and eschatological significance of the Jesus-event, are meant to serve as paradigms; after all, he is the Master!

It can be concluded that the Christologically-used ἐρχεσθαι is pregnant with meaning: this dynamic verb expresses many facets of the early Church's understanding and appreciation of the significance and implications of the Incarnation.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of periodicals are those listed in every issue of Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Grammatical and other abbreviations (easily decipherable) not listed below are found in Blass-Debrunner, xxxvi f. Besides these, the following will also be found used:

### 1. Periodicals

BETL = Bibliotheca ETL (Louvain)  
EstEcl = Estudios Eclesiásticos (Madrid)  
JSJ = Journal for the Study of Judaism (Leiden)  
RSPT = Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques (Paris)  
ThStKr = Theologische Studien und Kritiken (Leipzig)  
VetChr = Vetera Christianorum (Bari)

### 2. Special Abbreviations

Bl-D = Blass-Debrunner, Greek Grammar (cf. Bibliography)  
Billerbeck = [Strack]-Billerbeck (cf. Bibliography)  
col. = column(s)  
diff. = different(ly)  
exc. = except  
FS = Festschrift (in honor of ...)  
Gk = Greek  
Gpl. = Gospel(s)  
HS = Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (cf. Bibliography)  
JnB = John the Baptist  
Lkan, Mkan, Mtan = Lukan, Markan, Matthean  
NTGk = New Testament Greek (grammars; preceded by author)  
NTTh = New Testament Theology by ... (preceded by author)  
part. = participle  
pte. = present tense  
RLk, RMk, RMt = the final Lkan, Mkan, Mtan redactor  
SM = Son of Man (apocalyptic figure; underlined=book title)  
ST = Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition (cf. Bibliography)  
Syn = the Synoptic Gospels  
Tg = Targum  
O/O/O+O = number of times a word or expression occurs in  
Mt/Mk/Lk+Acts

Scripture citations in English are taken from the New English Bible (=NEB) for the OT and Apocrypha. The NT English is my own rendering (often literal).

A Note About Footnote Citations. All commentaries are mentioned in exactly the same way the Gospels are, i.e. Mt = commentary to Matthew, by ... (preceded by author's name). Other publications are cited in the shortest possible form whenever full bibliographical information is found in the Bibliography itself. This allows me to avoid the at times irritating abbreviations art.cit. and op.cit. which I shall use only when the work was already cited in the same page. Whenever a publication is not found in the Bibliography full information will be found where cited.



## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

### A. AUXILIARY INSTRUMENTS (Grammars, Lexica, Concordances)

- Aland, K. (ed.) Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis. 4th ed., Stuttgart 1967.
- [Bauer, W.] - Arndt, W.F. and Gingrich, F.W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translation and adaptation of W. Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments (4th ed., Berlin 1952). Chicago-Cambridge 1957.
- Beyer, K. Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. Band I: Satzlehre, Teil 1, (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 1). Göttingen 1968.
- Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A Translation and Revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by R.W. Funk. Chicago-Cambridge 1961.
- Dalman, G. Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch. 2d ed., Leipzig 1902 (= Darmstadt 1960).
- Hatch, E. and Redpath, H.A. A Concordance of the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books), 3 vols. Oxford 1897 (= Graz-Austria 1954).
- Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, 2 vols. New York-Berlin 1926 (= Tel-Aviv 1972).
- Kasowski, C.J. אוצר לשון משנה. קונקורדאנצ'א על ששה סדרי משנה, 2 vols. Jerusalem 1914, 1927.
- אוצר התרגום. קונקורדאנצ'א לתרגום אונקלוס, 2 vols. Jerusalem 1933, 1940.
- Thesaurus Talmudis [Babli]. Concordantiae Verborum. Jerusalem (vol.VII) 1959, (vol.VI) 1960.
- Kittel, G. + Friedrich, G. (eds.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Transl. from the German under the ed. of G.W. Bromiley), 9 vols. Grand Rapids 1964-1974.
- Kuhn, K.G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen 1960.
- "Nachträge zur 'Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten'," RQ 4(1963/64), 163-234.
- Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. and Jones, H.S. Greek-English Lexicon with a Supplement ed. by E.A. Barber. 9th ed., Oxford 1968.
- Mandelkern, S. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. 8th ed., Jerusalem-Tel-Aviv 1969.
- Mandilaras, B.G. The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri. Athens 1973.

- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. 2d ed., Cambridge 1968.
- Moulton, J.H. and Howard, W.F. A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol.II: Accidence and Word Formation. Edinburgh 1929 (vol.III: see Turner, N.).
- Moulton, J.H. and Milligan, G. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources. London 1930.
- Moulton, W.F. and Geden, A.S. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th ed., Edinburgh 1963.
- Preisigke, F. (- Kiessling, E.) Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Aegypten, 3 vols. Berlin 1927-1931. Supplement by E. Kiessling. Amsterdam 1971.
- Turner, N. A Grammar of New Testament Greek [J.H. Moulton], vol.III: Syntax. Edinburgh 1963.
- Wahl, C.A. Clavis Librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum Philologica. [Adj. J.B. Bauer] Indicem Verborum in Libris Pseudepigraphis Usurpatorum. Graz 1972.
- Zerwick, M. Biblical Greek. English edition adapted from the 4th Latin edition by J. Smith, (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 114). Rome 1963.
- Analysis Philologica Novi Testamenti Graece. 3d ed., Rome 1966.
- B. SOURCES (Texts, Editions and Translations)
- a) Biblical:
- Biblia Hebraica, ed. R. Kittel. 10th ed., Stuttgart 1937.
- Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, ed. F.C. Burkitt. Vol.I: Text. Cambridge 1904.
- The Greek New Testament, ed. K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger and A. Wikgren. 2d ed., Stuttgart 1968.
- Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, ed. Eb. Nestle. 25th ed. by Erwin Nestle and K. Aland. Stuttgart 1963.
- Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textbestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte. II. Teil: Text mit Apparat, ed. H.F. von Soden. Göttingen 1913.
- Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. C. Tischendorf. Editio octava critica maior, 2 vols. Leipzig 1869.
- The New Testament in the Original Greek, ed. B.F. Westcott-F.J.A. Hort. Cambridge-London 1892.
- ספרי הברית החדשה [Retroversion by] F. Delitzsch. Berlin 1928.
- Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes, ed. A. Rahlfs, 2 vols. 8th ed., Stuttgart 1965.

b) Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha:

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English.  
Vol.I: Apocrypha, vol.II: Pseudepigrapha; ed. R.H. Charles.  
Oxford 1913.

Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece, ed. J.-C. Picard, (Pseudepigrapha  
Veteris Testamenti Graece, II). Leiden 1967, p.63-96.

L'Apocalypse d'Élie. Introduction, Traduction et Notes, by J.  
M. Rosenstiehl, (Textes et Etudes pour servir à l'histoire  
du Judaïsme Intertestamentaire, I). Paris 1972.

3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Henoch, ed. and transl. by H.  
Odeberg. Cambridge 1928.

Joseph et Aséneth. Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et  
Notes, by M. Philonenko, (Studia Post-Biblica, XIII).  
Leiden 1968.

The Lives of the Prophets. Greek Text and Translation, ed. C.  
C. Torrey, (JBL Monograph Series, I). Philadelphia 1946.

The Odes of Solomon. Edited with Translation and Notes by J.  
H. Charlesworth. Oxford 1973.

Paraleipomena Jeremiou, ed. and transl. by R.A. Kraft and A.-E.  
Purinton, (Texts and Translations 1, Pseudepigrapha Series,  
1). Philadelphia 1972.

Sibyllinische Weissagungen. Urtext und Uebersetzung, ed. A.  
Kurfess. Berlin 1951.

The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,  
ed. R.H. Charles. Oxford 1908 (= Darmstadt 1966).

The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions. Transl. by M.  
E. Stone, (Texts and Translations 2, Pseudepigrapha  
Series 2). Philadelphia 1972.

Testamentum Iobi, ed. S.P. Brock, (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testa-  
menti Graece, II). Leiden 1967, p.3-59.

c) Rabbinic and Other Jewish Related Literature:

The Bible in Aramaic, ed. A. Sperber. Vol.I: The Pentateuch  
according to Targum Onkelos. Leiden 1959.

Neofiti 1. Targum Palestinense, MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana,  
ed. A. Díez Macho. Vol.I: Génesis. Madrid-Barcelona  
1968.

The Targum of Isaiah, ed. and transl. by J.F. Stenning. Oxford  
1949.

Mechilta. Der älteste Halachische und Hagadische Commentar zum  
zweiten Buch Moses, ed. I.H. Weiss. Vienna 1865.

Mechilta. Ein tanaaitischer Midrasch zu Exodus, erstmal ins  
Deutsche übersetzt und erläutert von J. Winter und A.  
Wünsche. Leipzig 1909.

Midrash Rabba translated into English with Notes, Glossary and  
Indices, ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon, 10 vols. London  
1939.

משנה סדר גיטין, ed. Ch. Albeck, 6 vols. Jerusalem-Tel-Aviv  
1954-1959.

The Mishnah translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes, by H. Danby. Oxford 1933.

Der Babylonische Talmud, ed. L. Goldschmidt, 9 vols. Leipzig 1906-1935.

The Babylonian Talmud translated into English, ed. I. Epstein, 18 vols. London 1938-1952.

תלמוד ברושלין [Reproduction of the Krotoschin ed.]. New York 1949.

Tosefta, nach den Erfurter und Wiener Handschriften mit Parallelstellen und Varianten, ed. M.S. Zuckermann. Paderborn 1880 (= Jerusalem 1963).

Die Texte aus Qumran. Hebräisch und deutsch, ed. E. Lohse. 2d ed., Munich 1971.

The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Transl. by G. Vermes, (Penguin Books). Rev. ed., Middlesex-Baltimore 1968.

The "Genesis Apocryphon" of Qumran Cave I. [Text, translation and] A Commentary, by J.A. Fitzmyer, (BibOr, 18A). 2d ed., Rome 1971.

Allegro, J.M. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," JBL 75(1956), 174-187.

Memar Margah, ed. J. Macdonald. Vol.I: Text, vol.II: Translation, (BZAW, 84). Berlin 1963.

#### d) Ancient Ecclesiastic Writings:

Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina, ed. J.P. Minge. Paris.

Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca, ed. J.P. Minge. Paris.

N.B. The latest available editions of the ancient ecclesiastic writings have been consulted in the following series:

Corpus Christianorum. Series latina. Turnhout (Belgium).

Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig-Berlin.

Sources Chrétiennes. Directed by H. de Lubac, J. Daniélou and C. Mondésert. Paris.

#### e) N.T. Apocrypha (including Gnostic writings):

Hennecke, E.- Schneemelcher, W. (ed.) New Testament Apocrypha (English transl. edited and directed by R.McL. Wilson), 2 vols. London 1963, 1965.

Los Evangelios Apócrifos. Edición crítica y bilingüe, by A. de Santos Otero, (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 148). 2d ed., Madrid 1963.

Apocryphon Johannis. The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary, by S. Giversen, (Acta Theologica Danica, V). Copenhagen 1963.

Die Gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 [= Sophia Jesu Christi]. Herausgegeben, Übersetzt und bearbeitet von W.C. Till, (TU, 60). Berlin 1955.

"Das Evangelium nach Philippus," [German transl. by] H.-M. Schenke, in TLZ 84(1959), col.1-26.

The Gospel of Thomas, English translation by B.M. Metzger, in Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, ed. K. Aland (q.v.), p. 517-530.

The Gospel of Truth. A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel. Translation from the Coptic and Commentary by K. Grobel. New York 1960.

Die Pistis Sophia. Die Beiden Bücher des Jeû. Unbekanntes Altgnostisches Werk. 3d ed. revised by W. Till [Original ed. by C. Schmidt], Berlin 1959.

#### f) Other Writings and Papyri:

Avesta, livre sacré des Sectateurs de Zoroastre. Transl. by C. de Harlez, 3 vols. Paris-Liège 1875-1877.

Corpus Hermeticum, ed. A.D. Nock and A.J. Festugière, 4 vols. (Collection des Universités de France). Paris 1945-1954.

Ginza. Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer. Transl. by M. Lidzbarski, (Quellen der Religionsgeschichte, 4/13). Göttingen-Leipzig 1925.

Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer. Transl. by M. Lidzbarski. Giessen 1915.

Mandäische Liturgien, uebersetzt und erklärt von M. Lidzbarski, (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, NF XVII/1). Berlin 1920.

The Canonical Prayerbook of the Mandeans. Transl. by E.S. Drower. Leiden 1959.

Adam, A. (ed.) Texte zum Manichäismus, (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 175). Berlin 1954.

Andreas, F.C. and Henning, W. "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan," in Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin. Part I (1932) p.175-222, part II (1933), p.294-363, part III (1934), p. 848-912.

Orphica, ed. E. Abel, (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum). Leipzig-Prague 1885.

Josephus, Flavius The Jewish War. [Edited] with an English translation by H.St.J. Thackeray, 2 vols., (The Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass.-London 1927, 1928.

----- Jewish Antiquities. [Edited] with an English translation by H.St.J. Thackeray (vols.1 and 2), R. Marcus (vols. 2 to 5), A. Wikgren (vol.5) and L.H. Feldman (vol.6), 6 vols., (The Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass.-London 1930-1965.

Dittenberger, W. (ed.) Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, 2 vols. Leipzig 1903, 1905.

- Dittenberger, W. (ed.) Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, 4 vols. 3d ed., Leipzig 1915-1924.
- Kenyon, F.G. (ed.) Greek Papyri in the British Museum, 5 vols. London-Oxford 1893-1917.
- Preisendanz, K. (ed.) Papyri Graece Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri, 2 vols. Berlin-Leipzig 1928, 1931.
- Wilcken, W. Urkunden der Ptolomäerzeit, 2 vols. Berlin-Leipzig 1927, 1957.
- N.B. The publications of papyri consulted are not listed for two reasons: they are too numerous (in collections and periodicals) and, of the texts consulted, few proved to be relevant. All those available at the "Ecole Biblique de Jérusalem" have been consulted.

### C. COMMENTARIES

- Albright, W.F. and Mann, C.S. Matthew, (AB, 26). New York 1971.
- Allen, W.C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew, (ICC). Edinburgh 1907.
- Boismard, M.-E. Synopse des Quatre Evangiles en Français. Tome II: Commentaire. Paris 1972.
- Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Vol.I: Matthäus; vol.II: Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte; vol.IV: Excursus. Munich 1922-1928.
- Bonnard, P. L'Evangile selon saint Matthieu, (CNT, I). 2d ed., Neuchâtel 1970.
- Branscomb, B.H. The Gospel of Mark, (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London 1937.
- Carrington, P. According to Mark. A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel. Cambridge 1960.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. The Gospel According to Saint Mark, (Cambridge Greek Testament Commentaries). Cambridge 1959.
- Creed, J.M. The Gospel According to Luke. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. London 1930.
- Filson, F.V. The Gospel according to St Matthew, (Black's New Testament Commentaries). London 1960.
- Gaechter, P. Das Matthäus Evangelium. Innsbruck 1964.
- Gould, E. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark, (ICC). 2d ed., Edinburgh 1912.
- Grundmann, W. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, (THNT, 1). 2d ed., Berlin 1971.
- Das Evangelium nach Markus, (THNT, 2). 3d ed., Berlin 1966.
- Das Evangelium nach Lukas, (THNT, 3). 4th ed., Berlin 1967.
- Haenchen, E. Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen, (Sammlung Töpelmann, Zweite Reihe, 6). Berlin 1966.

- Johnson, S.E. The Gospel according to St Mark, (Black's New Testament Commentaries). London 1960.
- Klostermann, E. Das Markusevangelium, (HNT, 3). 3d ed., Tübingen 1936.
- Das Matthäusevangelium, (HNT, 4). 3d ed., Tübingen 1938.
- Das Lukasevangelium, (HNT, 5). 2d ed., Tübingen 1929.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon saint Marc, (EBib). 4th ed., Paris 1929.
- Évangile selon saint Matthieu, (EBib). 4th ed., Paris 1927.
- Évangile selon saint Luc, (EBib). 3d ed., Paris 1927.
- Leaney, A.R.C. The Gospel according to St Luke, (Black's New Testament Commentaries). London 1958.
- Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Markus, (Meyer, 1/2). Göttingen 1951.
- Das Evangelium des Matthäus, ed. by W. Schmauch, (Meyer, Sonderband). Göttingen 1956.
- Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke, (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London 1930.
- McNeile, A.H. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. London 1915.
- Nineham, D.E. The Gospel of St Mark, (The Pelican Gospel Commentaries). Middlesex-Baltimore 1963.
- Plummer, A. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. London 1915.
- A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke, (ICC). 4th ed., Edinburgh 1910.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. St Mark, (Westminster Commentaries). 4th ed., London 1936.
- Rengstorff, K.H. Das Evangelium nach Lukas, (NTD, 3). Göttingen 1937.
- Robinson, T.H. The Gospel of Matthew, (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London 1928.
- Schlatter, A. Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbstständigkeit. Stuttgart 1948.
- Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinen Quellen erklärt. Stuttgart 1931.
- Schmid, J. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, (RNT, 1). 3d ed., Regensburg 1956.
- Das Evangelium nach Markus, (RNT, 2). 3d ed., Regensburg 1954.
- Das Evangelium nach Lukas, (RNT, 3). 3d ed., Regensburg 1955.
- Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Markus, (NTD, 1). 5th ed., Göttingen 1949.

- Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, (NTD, 2). 5th ed., Göttingen 1950.
- Schulz, S. Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten. Zürich 1972.
- Schürmann, H. Das Lukasevangelium, (HTKNT, III/1). Erster Teil (1,1-9,50). Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1969.
- Schweizer, E. Das Evangelium nach Markus, (NTD, 1). Göttingen 1967.
- Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, (NTD, 2). Göttingen 1973.
- Strack, H.L.: see Billerbeck, P.
- Strathmann, H. Das Evangelium nach Markus, (NTD, 1). Göttingen 1949.
- Swete, H.B. The Gospel According to St Mark. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. 2d ed., London 1908.
- Taylor, V. The Gospel according to St. Mark. 2d ed., London-New York 1966.
- Zahn, T. Das Evangelium des Matthäus, (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, I). 4th ed., Leipzig-Erlangen 1922.
- Das Evangelium des Lucas, (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, III). 2d ed., Leipzig 1913.
- D. LITERATURE
- Alonso, J. "La parábola del médico en Mc.2,16-17," CB 16(1959), 10-13.
- Ashby, E. "The Coming of the Son of Man," ExpT 72(1960/61), 360-363.
- Banks, R. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law: Authenticity and Interpretation in Matthew 5:17-20," JBL 93(1974), 226-242.
- Barr, J. "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," Congress Volume, Oxford 1959, (VTSup, VII). Leiden 1960, 31-38.
- Barrett, C.K. "The Background of Mark 10:45," in New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson, ed. A.J.B. Higgins. Manchester 1959, 1-18.
- "Mark 10.45: A Ransom for Many," in idem, New Testament Essays. London 1972, 20-26.
- Barth, G. "Das Gesetzesverständnis des Evangelisten Matthäus," in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H.J. Held, Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium, (WMANT, 1). Neukirchen 1960, 54-154.
- Bauer, J.B. "Echte Jesusworte?," in W.C. van Unnik, Evangelien aus dem Nilsand. Frankfurt/M. 1960, 108-150.
- Berger, K. Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu. Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Teil I: Markus und Parallelen, (WMANT, 40). Neukirchen 1972.
- Best, E. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology, (NTSMS, 2). Cambridge 1965.



- Betz, O. "Jesu Heiliger Krieg," NovT 2(1957/58), 116-137.
- "Die Frage nach dem Messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu," NovT 6(1963), 20-48.
- Black, M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3d ed., Oxford 1967.
- "Uncomfortable Words: III. The Violent Word," ExpT 81 (1969/70), 115-118.
- Blenkinsopp, J. "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry," JBL 80(1961), 55-64.
- Bornkamm, G. Jesus of Nazareth (Transl. of the 3d German ed. by I. and F. McLuskey, and J.M. Robinson). Rev. ed., London 1963.
- Bover, J.M. "Autenticidad de Lc 9, 54-56," EstEcl 27(1953), 347-349.
- Braun, H. Qumran und das Neue Testament, 2 vols. Tübingen 1966.
- Brox, N. "Das messianische Selbstverständnis des historischen Jesus," in Vom Jesus zum Christus, ed. K. Schubert. Vienna 1964, 165-201.
- Bruston, C. "Une parole de Jésus mal comprise," RHPR 5(1925), 70-71.
- Büchsel, F. art. λύτρον, in TDNT IV, 340-349
- Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Transl. from the 3d German ed., with Supplementary notes, by J. Marsh). 2d (rev.) ed., Oxford 1968.
- Theology of the New Testament (Transl. from the German by K. Grobel), 2 vols. London 1952, 1955.
- Burkitt, F.C. "St Luke IX 54-56 and the Western 'Diatessaron'," JTS 28(1927), 48-53.
- Burney, C.F. The Poetry of Our Lord. An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ. Oxford 1925.
- Butler, B.C. The Originality of St Matthew. A Critique of The Two-Document Hypothesis. Cambridge 1951.
- Cadbury, H.J. The Style and Literary Method of Luke (HTS, VI). Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
- Calvert, D.G.A. "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus," NTS 18(1971/72), 209-219.
- Chapman, J. Matthew, Mark and Luke. A Study in the Order and Interrelation of the Synoptic Gospels (edited by J.M.T. Barton). London 1937.
- Christ, F. Jesus Sophia. Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern, (ATANT, 57). Zürich 1970.
- Colpe, C. art. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in TDNT VIII, 400-477.
- Conzelmann, H. The Theology of St Luke (Transl. from the 2d German ed. by G. Buswell). New York 1960.

- Cullmann, O. Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments. 2d ed., Tübingen 1958.
- "Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος," ConNt XII, in honorem A. Fridrichsen. Lund 1947, 26-32.
- Dalman, G. Die Worte Jesu, mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen Jüdischen Schriftums und der Aramäischen Sprache. 2d ed., Leipzig 1930 (= Darmstadt 1965).
- Jesus-Jeshua. Studies in the Gospels (Transl. from the German 1st ed. [incl. additional notes], by P.P. Levertoff). London 1929 (= New York 1971).
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (Jordan Lectures 1952). London 1956.
- Davies, W.D. Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, (JBL Monograph Series, VII). Philadelphia 1952.
- "Matthew, 5,17-18," in Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert, (Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, 4). Paris n.d. [1957?], 428-456.
- Deissmann, A. Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neu entdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt. 4th ed., Tübingen 1923.
- Delling, G. "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΗΝΑΙ," NovT 2(1957/58), 92-115.
- art.πληρώω, in TDNT VI, 286-298.
- Denis, A.-M. Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs de l'Ancien Testament, (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, I). Leiden 1970.
- Derrett, J.D.M. Appendix on Mk IX.12-13, Mal III.24, Micah VII.6, to "Herod's Oath and the Baptist's Head," BZ NF 9(1965), 242-246.
- Descamps, A. Les Justes et la Justice dans les évangiles et le christianisme primitif hormis la doctrine proprement paulinienne (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Dissertationes ad gradum magistri, Series II Tomus 43). Gembloux-Louvain 1950.
- "Essai d'interprétation de Mt.5,17-48. 'Formgeschichte' ou 'Redaktionsgeschichte'?", in Studia Evangelica. Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford 1957. Ed. K. Aland, F.L. Cross, et al., (TU, 73). Berlin 1959, 156-173.
- Dibelius, M. From Tradition to Gospel (Transl. from the 2d German ed. by B.L. Woolf), (The Scribner's Library, 124). New York n.d.
- Dodd, C.H. The Parables of the Kingdom. 2d ed., London 1936.
- "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus," in New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson, ed. A.J.B. Higgins. Manchester 1959, 106-118.
- Dupont, J. Les Béatitudes. Vol.II: La Bonne Nouvelle (new ed.); vol.III: Les Évangélistes, (EBib). Paris 1969, 1973.

- Dupont, J. "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Matthieu 11,2-6; Luc 7,18-23)," NRT 83(1961), 805-821, 943-959.
- Emerton, J.A. "The Aramaic background of Mark x.45," JTS 11(1960), 334-335.
- Farmer, W.R. The Synoptic Problem. A Critical Analysis. New York 1964.
- Feuillet, A. "Jésus et la Sagesse Divine d'après les Évangiles Synoptiques," RB 62(1955), 161-196.
- "La Coupe et le Baptême de la Passion (Mc,X,35-40; cf. Mt.XX,20-23; Lc,XII,50)," RB 74(1967), 356-391.
- "Le Logion sur la Rançon," RSPT 51(1967), 365-402.
- "Morale Ancienne et Morale Chrétienne d'après Mt V.17-20; Comparaison avec la doctrine de l'Épître aux Romains," NTS 17(1970/71), 123-237.
- Fievig, P. Jesu Bergpredigt. Rabbinische Texte zum Verständniss der Bergpredigt, ins Deutsch übersetzt, in ihren Ursprachen dargeboten und mit Erläuterungen und Lesarten versehen. Göttingen 1924.
- Fitzmyer, J. "Methodology in the Study of the Aramaic Substratum of Jesus' Sayings in the New Testament," in Jésus aux Origines de la Christologie, ed. J. Dupont, (BETL, XL). Louvain-Gembloux 1975, 73-102.
- Book Review of M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, in CBQ 30(1968), 417-428.
- Flender, H. St Luke Theologian of Redemptive History (Transl. from the German by R.H. and I. Fuller). London 1967.
- Fohrer, G. and Foerster, W. art. σφίω κτλ., in TDNT VII, 965-1003.
- Ford, J.M. "'He That Cometh' and the Divine Name," JSJ 1(1970), 144-147.
- Formesyn, R.E.C. "Was there a Pronominal Connection for the 'Bar Nasha' Selfdesignation?," NovT 8(1966), 1-35.
- Frövig, D.A. Das Sendungsbewusstsein Jesu und der Geist. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Berufsbewusstsein Jesu, (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, vol.29/3). Gütersloh 1924.
- Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York 1965.
- "The Clue of Jesus' Self-understanding," in Studia Evangelica, vol.III, ed. F.L. Cross, (TU, 88). Berlin 1964, 58-66.
- Gaboury, A. La Structure des Évangiles Synoptiques. La Structure-type à l'origine des Synoptiques, (NovTSup, XXII). Leiden 1970.
- Gamba, G.G. "Considerazioni in margine alla redazione di Mc 2,13-17," Divus Thomas 72(1969), 201-226.
- George, A. "La venue de Jésus, cause de division entre les hommes," in Assemblées du Seigneur, n.51. Paris 1972, 62-71.

- Grant, F.C. "The Authenticity of Jesus' Sayings," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, (BZNW 21). Berlin 1954, 137-143.
- Grant, R.M. - Freedman, D.N. The Secret Sayings of Jesus. New York 1960.
- Graystone, G. "I have come to cast fire on the earth ...," Scr 4(1949-51), 135-141.
- Gundry, R.H. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, (NovTSup, XVIII). Leiden 1967.
- Hahn, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum, (FRLANT, 83). 3d ed., Göttingen 1966.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R.G. Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man. A Study of the idea of Pre-existence in the New Testament, (NTSMS, 21). Cambridge 1973.
- "Attitudes to the Law in Matthew's Gospel: a Discussion of Matthew 5:18," BR 17(1972), 19-32.
- Harnack, A. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament: vol.II: Sprüche und Reden Jesu. Die Zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas. Leipzig 1907.
- "'Ich bin gekommen'. Die ausdrücklichen Selbstzeugnisse Jesu über den Zweck seiner Sendung und seines Kommens," ZTK 22(1912), 1-30.
- Haufe, G. "Das Menschensohn-Problem in der gegenwärtigen wissenschaftlichen Diskussion," EvT 26(1966), 130-141.
- Hawkins, J.C. Horae Synopticae. Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem. 2d ed., Oxford 1909 (= 1968).
- Higgins, A.J.B. Jesus and the Son of Man. London 1964.
- Hirsch, E. Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums. Vol.I: Das Werden des Markus-Evangeliums, vol.II: Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus. Tübingen 1941, 1951<sup>2</sup>.
- Hoffmann, P. Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle, (NTAbh, NF.8). Münster 1972.
- "Die bessere Gerechtigkeit. Auslegung der Bergpredigt III (Mt.5,17-37)," BLEb 10(1969), 175-189.
- Honeyman, A.M. "Matthew V.18 and the validity of the Law," NTS 1(1954/55), 141-142.
- Hooker, M.D. The Son of Man in Mark. London 1967.
- Hummel, R. Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium, (BEvT, 33). 2d ed., Munich 1966.
- van Iersel, B.M.F. "La vocation de Lévi (Mc.,II,13-17, Mt., IX,9-13). Traditions et rédactions," in De Jésus aux Évangiles. Tradition et Rédaction dans les Évangiles synoptiques, ed. I. de la Potterie, (BETL, XXV). Gembloux-Paris 1967, 212-232.
- Jenni, E. "'Kommen' im Theologischen Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments," in Wort-Gebot-Glaube. Walter Eichrodt zum 80. Geburtstag, (ATANT, 59). Zürich 1970, 251-261.

- Jeremias, J. Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu. 3d ed., Göttingen 1960.
- Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period (Transl. from the 3d German ed. by F.H. and C.H. Cave). London 1969.
- The Parables of Jesus (Transl. from the 6th German ed. by S.H. Hooke). London 1963 (rev. ed.).
- Jesus' Promise to the Nations (Transl. from the German by S.H. Hooke), (SBT, 24). London 1967 (rev. ed.).
- Unknown Sayings of Jesus (Transl. from the 3d German ed. by R.H. Fuller). 2d ed., London 1964.
- New Testament Theology, Part I: The Proclamation of Jesus (Transl. from the German by J. Bowden), (New Testament Library). London 1971.
- "Zöllner und Sünder," ZNW 30(1931), 293-300.
- "Die Lampe unter dem Scheffel," ZNW 39(1940), 237-240.
- "Das Lösegeld für Viele (Mk.10,45)," Jud 3(1947/48), 249-264 (= ABBA, 216-229).
- "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," ZNW 58 (1967), 159-172.
- "Παῖς (Θεοῦ) im Neuen Testament," in idem, ABBA, Göttingen 1966, 191-216.
- "Characteristics of the ipsissima vox Jesu," in The Prayers of Jesus, (SBT, Second Series, 6). London 1967, 108-115.
- art. 'Ηλ(ε)ίος, in TDNT II, 928-941.
- Jeremias, Jörg Theophanie. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung, (WMANT, 10). Neukirchen-Vluyn 1965.
- Jülicher, A. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Teil II: Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der Drei ersten Evangelien. Tübingen 1910.
- Käsemann, E. "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," ZTK 57(1960) 162-185 (= Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, vol.II, 2d ed., Göttingen 1965, 82-104).
- "Sätze Heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament," NTS 1(1954/55), 248-260 (= Exegetische Versuche..., II, 69-82).
- Kilpatrick, G.D. The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Oxford 1946.
- Klausner, J. The Messianic Idea in Israel. From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah (Transl. from the 3d Hebrew ed. by W.F. Stinespring). New York 1955.
- Knox, W.L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, ed. by H. Chadwick. Vol.I: St Mark, vol.II: St Luke and St Matthew. Cambridge 1953, 1957.
- Köster, H. Synoptische Ueberlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern, (TU, 65). Berlin 1957.
- "Die ausserkanonischen Herrenworte als Produkte der christlichen Gemeinde," ZNW 48(1957), 220-237.

- Kruse, H. "Die 'Dialektische Negation' als Semitisches Idiom," VT 4(1954), 385-400.
- Kuhn, H.-W. Aeltere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium, (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 8). Göttingen 1971.
- Kümmel, W.G. Promise and Fulfilment. The Eschatological Message of Jesus (Transl. from the 3d German ed. by D.M. Barton), (SBT, 23). London 1957.
- Kuss, O. "Zur Frage einer vorpaulinischen Todestaufer," MTZ 4(1953), 1-17.
- Lamarche, P. "L'appel à la conversion et à la foi. La vocation de Lévi (Mc, 2,13-17)," Lumen vitae 25(1970), 125-136.
- Lang, F. art.  $\pi\upsilon\phi$ , in TDNT VI, 928-948.
- Légasse, S. "Approche de l'Épisode préévangélique des Fils de Zébédée (Marc x.35-40 par.)," NTS 20(1973/74), 161-177.
- Leivestad, R. "An Interpretation of Matt 11<sup>19</sup>," JBL 71(1952), 179-181.
- Levison, N. "Lutron," SJT 12(1959), 277-285.
- Lightfoot, R.H. "A Consideration of Three Passages in St. Mark's Gospel," in In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer, ed. W. Schmauch. Stuttgart 1951, 110-115.
- Ljungman, H. Das Gesetz Erfüllen. Matth. 5,17ff. und 3,15 untersucht, (LUA, NF. Avd. 1 Bd 50 Nr.6). Lund 1954.
- Loewe, W.P. "Towards and Interpretation of Lk 19:1-10," CBQ 36(1974), 321-331.
- Lohse, E. Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu-Christi, (FRLANT, 64). Göttingen 1955.
- Löning, K. "Ein Platz für die Verlorenen," BLieb 12(1971), 198-208.
- Lovison, T. "La pericopa della Cananea, Mt. 15,21-28," RivB 19(1971/72), 273-305.
- Lührmann, D. Die Redaktion der Logienquelle, (WMANT, 33). Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969.
- "Die Frage nach Kriterien für ursprüngliche Jesusworte-eine Problemskizze," in Jésus aux Origines de la Christologie, ed. J. Dupont, (BETL, XL). Gembloux-Louvain 1975, 59-72.
- Manson, T.W. The Teaching of Jesus. Studies in its form and content. 2d ed., Cambridge 1935.
- The Sayings of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and Commentary. London 1950.
- Manson, W. Jesus the Messiah. The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ: with special reference to Form-criticism. London 1943.
- Marxsen, W. Mark the Evangelist. Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel (Transl. from the 2d German ed. by J. Boyce et al.). New York 1969.

- Massaux, E. Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée, (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Dissertationes ad Gradum Magistri in Facultate Theologica vel in Facultate Iuris Canonici, Series Secunda, 42). Gembloux-Louvain 1950.
- McArthur, H.K. "Basic Issues: A Survey of Recent Gospel Research," Int 18(1964), 39-55.
- McConnell, R.S. Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel. The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew, (Theologische Dissertationen [Basel], II). Basel 1969.
- McEleney, N.J. "Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7:1-23," CBQ 34(1972), 431-460.
- McNamara, M. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, (AnBib, 27). Rome 1966.
- Médebielle, A. "La vie donnée en rançon (Mc. 10,45; Mt.20,28)," Bib 4(1923), 3-40.
- Mees, M. "Jesusworte in Lukas 12 und ihre Komposition nach Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis," VetChr 7(1970), 285-303.
- Metzger, B.M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. London-New York 1971.
- Meyer, R. "Der Am hā-Āreš," Jud 3(1947), 169-199.
- Michaelis, W. art. μάχαρα, in TDNT IV, 524-527.
- Michel, O. "'Ich komme' (Jos.Bell.III,400)," TZ 24(1968), 123f.
- Miranda, J.P. Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den johanneischen Sendungsformel. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Christologie und Ekklesiologie, (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII: Theologie, 7). Bern-Frankfurt/M. 1972.
- Montefiore, C.G. The Synoptic Gospels, (Library of Biblical Studies), 2 vols. New York 1968 [Reprint of the 2d ed. of 1927].
- Moule, C.F.D. "Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse," NTS 14(1967/68), 293-320.
- Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh (Transl. by G.W. Anderson). Oxford 1959.
- Muilenburg, J. "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," JBL 79(1960), 197-209.
- Mundle, W. art. "Kommen/έρχομαι," in Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament, ed. L. Coenen et al. Vol. II/1. Wuppertal 1969, 803-807.
- Mussner, F. "Der nicht erkannte Kairos (Mt 11,16-19=Lk 7,31-35)," Bib 40(1959), 599-613.
- "Wege zum Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," BZ NF 12(1968), 161-172.
- Neirynck, F. Duality in Mark. Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction, (BETL, XXXI). Louvain 1972.

- Norden, E. Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte Religiöser Rede. Leipzig-Berlin 1913.
- Oepke, A. art.  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega$ ,  $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ , in TDNT I, 529-545.
- Oxford Society of Historical Theology, A Committee of the, The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers. Oxford 1905.
- Pax, E. ΕΠΙΘΑΝΕΙΑ. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie, (Münchener theologische Studien. Historische Abteilung, 10). Munich 1955.
- Pernot, H. Études sur la langue des Évangiles, (Collection de l'Institut Néo-hellénique de l'Université de Paris, 6). Paris 1927.
- Perrin, N. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, (New Testament Library). London 1967.
- Pesch, R. Der Besessene von Gerasa. Entstehung und Ueberlieferung einer Wundergeschichte, (SBS, 56). Stuttgart 1972.
- "Ein Tag vollmächtigen Wirkens Jesu in Kapharnaum (Mk 1, 21-34. 35-39)," BLeb 9(1968), 114-128, 177-195, 261-277.
- "Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi. Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums (Mk 1, 1-15)," in Die Zeit Jesu. Festschrift für H. Schlier, ed. G. Bornkamm and K. Rahner. Freiburg 1970, 108-144.
- "Das Zöllnergastmahl (Mk 2, 15-17)," in Mélanges Bédaride. Gembloux 1970, 63-87.
- Pidoux, G. Le Dieu qui vient. Espérance d'Israël, (Cahiers Théologiques de l'Actualité Protestante, 17). Neuchâtel 1947.
- Preuss, H.D. art.  $\chi\lambda\lambda$ , in TWAT I, col. 536-568.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen. 3d ed., Leipzig-Berlin 1927.
- Poimandres. Studien zur Griechisch-Aegyptischen und Frühchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig-Berlin 1904.
- Resch, A. Agrapha. Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente, (TU, V/4). Leipzig 1889.
- Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien, (TU, X/1-3). Leipzig 1893-1897.
- Rese, M. Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas, (Studien zum Neuen Testament, I). Gütersloh 1969.
- Roberts, T.A. "Some Comments on Matthew x. 34-36 and Luke xii. 51-53," ExpT 69(1957-60), 304-306.
- Robinson, J.A.T. Jesus and His Coming. The Emergence of a Doctrine. London 1957.
- Roloff, J. "Anfänge der Soteriologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu (Mk. X. 45 und Lk. XXII. 27)," NTS 19(1972/73), 38-64.
- Ropes, J.H. Die Sprüche Jesu die in den Kanonischen Evangelien nicht überliefert sind, (TU, XIV/2). Leipzig 1896.



- Ross, J.M. "The Rejected Words in Luke 9<sup>54-56</sup>," ExpT 84 (1972/73), 85-88.
- Rothfuchs, W. Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums, (BWANT, 88). Stuttgart 1969.
- Ruppert, L. Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs, (SBS, 59). Stuttgart 1972.
- Russell, D.S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, (Old Testament Library). London 1964.
- Sand, A. Das Gesetz und die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus, (Biblische Untersuchungen, 11). Regensburg 1974.
- Sanders, E.P. The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition, (NTSMS, 9). Cambridge 1969.
- Schäfer, P. "Die Torah der messianischen Zeit," ZNW 65(1974), 27-42.
- Schelkle, K.H. Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments. Heidelberg 1949.
- Schmid, H. "Gottesbild, Gottesschau und Theophanie," Jud 23 (1967), 241-254.
- Schmid, J. Matthäus und Lukas. Eine Untersuchung des Verhältnisses ihrer Evangelien, (BSt, XXIII/2-4). Freiburg 1930.
- Schmidt, K.L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur Ältesten Jesusüberlieferung. Berlin 1919 (= Darmstadt 1969).
- Schnackenburg, R. "Ich-Aussagen," LTK, vol.5, col.594-595.
- Schneider, J. art. ἔρχομαι κτλ., in TDNT II, 666-684.
- art. ἦκω, in TDNT II, 926-928.
- Schnutenhaus, F. "Das kommen und erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament," ZAW 76(1964), 1-22.
- Schramm, T. Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas. Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, (NTSMS, 14). Cambridge 1971.
- Schreiber, J. Theologie des Vertrauens. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Markusevangeliums. Hamburg 1967.
- Schulz, A. Nachfolgen und Nachahmen. Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentlichen Jüngerschaft zur urchristlichen Vorbildethik, (StANT, VI). Munich 1962.
- Schürmann, H. Jesu Abschiedsrede (Lk 22,21-38). III. Teil einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22,7-38, (NTAbh, XX/5). Münster 1957.
- "Wer Daher einer dieser geringsten Gebote auflöst...", in idem, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien, (Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament). Düsseldorf 1968, 126-136.

- Schürmann, H. "Die Sprache des Christus. Sprachliche Beobachtungen an den synoptischen Herrenworten," BZ 2(1958), 54-84 (=Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen 83-108).
- "Mt 10,5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes," in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, 137-149.
- Schweizer, E. "Matth.5,17-20 - Anmerkungen zum Gesetzesverständnis des Matthäus," TLZ 77(1952), col.479-484.
- "Der Menschensohn," ZNW 50(1959), 185-209.
- "Noch einmal Mt 5,17-20," in Das Wort und die Wörter. Festschrift Gerhard Friedrich, ed. H. Balz and S. Schulz. Stuttgart 1973, 69-73.
- Seynaeve, J. "La Justice Nouvelle (Matthieu, v,17-20)," in Message et Mission. Recueil Commémoratif du X<sup>e</sup> Anniversaire de la Faculté de Théologie, (Publications de l'Université Lovanium de Kinshasa, 23). Louvain-Paris 1968, 53-75.
- Seper, F.H. "Καὶ τὶ θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνέσθῃ (Lc 12,49b)," VD 36 (1958), 147-153.
- Sjöberg, E. Der Verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, (Skrifter Utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, LIII). Lund 1955.
- "ܡܬܐ וܡܬܐ ܕܝܠܝܡܝܢܝܢ im Hebräischen und Aramäischen," AcOr 21(1953), 57-65, 91-107.
- Soiron, T. Die Logia Jesu. Eine Literarkritische und Literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum synoptischen Problem, (NTAbh IV/4). Münster 1916.
- de Solages, Mgr. La Composition des Évangiles de Luc et de Matthieu et leurs sources. Leiden 1973.
- Staerk, W. Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen. Stuttgart-Berlin 1938.
- Stendahl, K. The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament (with a new Introduction). Philadelphia 1968.
- Strecker, G. Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus, (FRLANT, 82). Göttingen 1962.
- Streeter, B.H. The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins. London 1924.
- Suggs, M.J. Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel. Cambridge, Mass. 1970.
- Suhl, A. Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium. Gütersloh 1965.
- Sundwall, J. Die Zusammensetzung des Markusevangeliums, (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora, IX). Åbo 1934.
- von Sybel, L. "Vom Wachsen der Christologie im synoptischen Evangelium," ThStKr 100(1927/28), 362-401.
- Taylor, V. Jesus and His Sacrifice. A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels. London 1937.

- Taylor, V. "The Origin of the Markan Passion-Sayings," NTS 1 (1954/55), 159-167.
- Teeple, H.M. "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology," JBL 84(1965), 213-250.
- Tödt, H.E. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition (Transl. from the 2d German ed. by D.M. Barton), (New Testament Library). London 1965.
- Torrey, C.C. The Four Gospels: A New Translation. New York 1933.
- Trilling, W. Das Wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums, (StANT, X). 3d ed., Munich 1964.
- Turner, C.H. "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel," JTS 25(1924), 377-86; 26(1925), 12-20, 145-156, 225-240, 337-346; 27(1926), 58-62; 28(1927), 9-30, 349-362; 29(1928), 275-289, 346-361.
- "A Textual Commentary on Mark I.," JTS 28(1927), 145-158.
- Vielhauer, P. "Jesus und der Menschensohn," in idem, Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament, (Theologische Bücherei, 31). Munich 1965, 92-137.
- Vögtle, A. "Synoptische Beteuerungsworte: Mt 5,18=Lk 16,17; Mk 13,31 par.," in idem, Das Neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos, (Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament). Düsseldorf 1970, 99-107.
- "Exegetische Erwägungen über das Wissen und Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," in idem, Das Evangelium und die Evangelien, (Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament). Düsseldorf 1971, 296-344.
- Voss, G. Die Christologie der Lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen, (Studia Neotestamentica, Studia II). Paris-Bruges 1965.
- Walker, R. Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium, (FRLANT, 91). Göttingen 1967.
- Ward, R.A. "St. Luke xii.49: καὶ τὶ θέλω εἰ ἡδὴ ἀνήθην," ExpT 63(1951/52), 92-93.
- Weniger, L. "Theophanien, altgriechische Götteradvente," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 22(1923/24), 16-57.
- White, N.J.D. "Not Peace, but a Sword," The Expositor, 8th series, 7(1914), 465-472.
- Wichelhaus, M. "Am Ersten Tage der Woche (Mk. i 35-39 und die didaktischen Absichten des Markus-Evangelisten)," NovT 11(1969), 45-66.
- Wolff, H.W. Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum. 3d ed., Berlin 1952.
- van der Woude, A.S. Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân, (Studia Semitica Neerlandica, 3). Assen 1957.
- Wright, L.E. Alterations of the Words of Jesus, As Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century, (Harvard Historical Monographs, XXV). Cambridge, Mass. 1952.

- Wrege, H.Th. Die Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt (WUNT, 9). Tübingen 1968.
- Zaphiris, G. Le texte de l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après les citations de Clément d'Alexandrie comparées aux citations des Pères et des Théologiens grecs du II<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Gembloux 1970.
- Zerwick, M. Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil. Ein Beitrag zur stilistischen Durcharbeitung des Neuen Testaments, (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici). Rome 1937.
- Zimmermann, H. Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Darstellung der Historisch-kritischen Methode. 3d ed., Stuttgart 1970.

III. COME TO FULFILL THE LAW: Mt.5,17(-20)

A.